The Journal

OF

PHILOLOGY

EDITED BY

HENRY JACKSON, LITT. D.

H. W. GARROD, M.A.

J. A. PLATT, M.A.

VOL. XXXIV.

London:

MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

Cambridge: BOWES AND BOWES.

DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO., LTD.

1918

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY
J. B. PEACE, M.A.,
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

CONTENTS

No. LXVII.

PAGE

Ingram Bywater. C. CANNAN and P. S. ALLEN 1

Political and Legal Aspects of the Trial of Rabirius. E. G. HARDY 12

Juvenal and Two of his Editors A. E. HOUSMAN 40

A Collation of the History of Socrates Scholasticus, Books IV—VII, with the Old Armenian Version and with the Latin Version of Epiphanius Scholasticus as preserved in the Historia Tripartita of Cassiodorius. F. C. CONYBEARE 47

On some Ancient Plant-Names. II. W. T. THISELTON-DYER . 78

The 'Bugonia' Myth. A. E. SHIPLEY 97

Fragments of Greek Poetry from Papyri in the Library of the University of Chicago. J. U. POWELL 106

Apollonius again. ARTHUR PLATT 129

Bucolica. ARTHUR PLATT 142

Notes on Aristotle, Metaphysics A 6. C. M. GILLESPIE . . . 151

Emendations in the Eudemian Ethics. W. D. ROSS . . . 155

Eudemian Ethics 1229 a 14 ; 1235 a 35 ; 1244 a 1. H. J. . . 159

Note on the so-called 'Gnomica Basileensia.' I. B. . . . 160

No. LXVIII.

	PAGE
The Evidence as to Caesar's Legal Position in Gaul. E. G. Hardy.	161
Transpositions in the Ibis of Ovid. A. E. Housman . . .	222
Aristophanica. Arthur Platt	239
Aristotelica. H. Richards	247
The Shorter Glosses of Placidus. W. M. Lindsay	255
The 'Abolita' Glossary (Vat. Lat. 3321). W. M. Lindsay . .	267
Horace *Carm.* I 14. Walter Leaf	283
On some Ancient Plant-Names. III. W. T. Thiselton-Dyer .	290

THE JOURNAL
OF
PHILOLOGY

INGRAM BYWATER.

§ i

Ingram Bywater died on Dec. 17, 1914. His failing strength had been for some time a matter of concern to his friends, but it was not until the late autumn of 1914 that for the first time in his life, so far as he could remember, and 'with great indignation' he was obliged to spend a day in bed. He rallied, and as late as Nov. 20 he attended a meeting of the Delegates of the Clarendon Press on his way back to London from a visit to an old friend in the Midlands. His last illness began on Sunday, Dec. 13, and he died on the following Thursday. Four days later he was buried at Salcombe Regis, near Sidmouth.

Bywater was born in London in 1840, and after some years at University and King's College Schools matriculated at Oxford in 1859 as a scholar of Queen's College. He was not, he always averred, by any means a precocious schoolboy, or even a brilliant undergraduate: of some academic exercises, such as Latin Verse, he seldom spoke without a shudder. He read privately with Robinson Ellis, and, together with Pater, who was his contemporary at Queen's, took at least one essay to Jowett, then Regius Professor and not yet Master of Balliol. When the essays were read, Jowett said, 'Thank you, both you young gentlemen will take first classes in your schools.' In the event Pater was somehow put into the second class:

Bywater, to use his own old-fashioned phrase, 'did a first' in Literis Humanioribus, and received, it is proper to note, the then possible complimentary fourth in Mathematics. In the subsequent examinations for fellowships, Pater was elected at Brasenose and Bywater at Exeter. He was Tutor at Exeter from 1867 to 1884, and took college work continuously till he became Professor in 1893. He was Proctor in 1873, and for a few years represented the Masters of Arts on Council. He became a Curator of the Bodleian in 1884, and for a short time performed the duties of a sub-Librarian. In 1879 he became a Delegate of the Press. In 1883 he was appointed to the new University Readership in Greek, and in 1893 to the Regius Professorship. His edition of Heraclitus was published in 1877, Priscianus Lydus (for the Berlin Academy) in 1886, his text of the Ethics in 1890, Contributions to the Criticism of Aristotle's Ethics in 1892, his text of the Poetics in 1898, and his definitive edition of it in 1909. In 1908 Bywater resigned his Professorship, and thenceforth lived in London, though to the last he seldom missed a meeting of the Clarendon Press.

In the Oxford of the sixties and seventies Bywater—as he wrote of his friend Henry Nettleship—'was one of the small band of academic reformers who thought that a university should be organised with a view to research as well as with a view to education,' and, like Nettleship, 'in taking this line he was to some extent influenced by Mark Pattison.' Able pupils who took work to him have always acknowledged their good fortune; but for the instruction of reluctant youth Bywater had no turn, and he was proud of his opposition in Council to the policy which gave to the Examination Schools money which he would have liked to spend upon the Bodleian. 'Multi pertransibunt' he used to say of the big building in the High, 'neque augebitur scientia.' It pleased him to the last to regard himself as a very unsuccessful university reformer, and a very inefficient 'server of tables.' But in fact the 'small band' was very successful. Bywater's own early lectures, and Pelham's, when Pelham reinforced him at Exeter, brought new vigour into the schools: it was a new thing when 'ambitious

young men from Balliol escaped from tribal pedagogy' to listen to Bywater upon the Poetics, meeting the Germans upon equal terms on what was then their own ground. 'Vahlen *thinks* that I agree with him, but I DON'T' was the antithesis of Jowett's 'Do not dispute about texts: buy a good text.' Measured by the standard of productivity nothing in the academic field has been more fertile: the Oxford Classical Texts which have broken the monopoly of Herr Teubner, and invaded Germany itself, have Bywater and Ellis for their only begetters. And if in later years Bywater, as Professor, attracted smaller audiences, the reason was not that the College tutors had relapsed into obscurantism, but that the methods in which he was the pioneer were being followed in the Colleges and applied to other studies, archaeological, historical and philosophical, all drawing their devotees from the same scanty supply of hearers, fit though few.

The Oxford Aristotelian Society came into existence without a formal constitution in the early eighties, about the time that Bywater became Reader. He took the chair at the first meeting (which beginning first with the first things proceeded to read Metaphysics Z), and the society met in his rooms under his presidency until he resigned his Professorship in 1908. The society has had its vicissitudes. Shute, who held a flaming torch in the van of the earliest reconnaissances, died: other qualified commentators fell away, finding themselves deprived of sleep, and of the younger men several departed to professorships and the like away from Oxford. At one time the effective force of the society was not above three or four. It was characteristic of Bywater that he never remarked on the rise or fall of the attendance, and never recognised it by any change in his preparations. There was always every week on the appointed day the same big table cleared, the same lighted sconces, the same number of teacups. In a quarter of a century Bywater himself cannot have missed half a dozen of the weekly meetings. Once a backslider corrupted some friends and announced that they would not attend next week—they were going to hear an itinerant philosopher who had come up to give a lecture. 'Ah,' said Bywater, 'in that

case —— will dine with me, and after dinner we will do our best together to construe the words of the master of them that KNOW.' Gradually as the generations grew up recruits came in, and when Bywater retired from the presidency, there was quite a little company to sign a very cordial address which commemorated the benefit conferred on the Oxford exegesis of Aristotle by the common study of the more important writings of the philosopher, and spoke of the personal debt of those who had been permitted an insight into the methods of Bywater's own laborious, profound and brilliant scholarship[1].

At the Clarendon Press, to which so much devoted service is given by the members of its Board, Bywater's thirty-five years of heavy work will stand unrivalled. He took a personal interest in every piece of sound learning that was offered for publication. 'That book of ——,' he said, 'has given me a horrible interest in mediaeval geography, and there is no subject so remote from my proper studies.' He found—or made—time to assist or direct all kinds of undertakings in very different fields. He studied, for instance, not merely all the proofs of the Oxford Classical Texts (which were planned on the model of his own edition of the Ethics) but huge slices of the English Dictionary. When everyone else had failed to find the word *inferentia*, and when at least one dissertation had proved that it could not have been used in Latin, Bywater produced a quotation from Abelard. 'Murray,' he said, 'asked me for an early instance of *poetria* ('poetry'), and when I tell you that I found it at last in a seventh-century scholium to the Epistles of Horace, you may imagine that it took me some time: but I am sometimes lucky on Sunday.' Another Sunday produced—by telegram on Monday morning—a Gladstonian use of 'science' in the old Oxford sense of metaphysics. Bywater's immense bibliographical knowledge in many fields of learning enabled him to estimate with accuracy the value of a new book, regarded as a contribution to the common stock; and his long experience gave him an uncanny skill in predicting without arithmetical data the cost of production and the willingness—or unwillingness—of the public to buy. He never missed an

[1] The address is printed in *Oxford Magazine*, Feb. 25, 1908.

opportunity of getting a good piece of work before the world; and if he sometimes set limits to an enterprise, or relegated what was conceived to be a book 'to the pages of a learned periodical,' it was not a scholar's hypercriticism but a practical man's estimate of possibilities and values that suggested his caution. To all the problems of practical administration he brought a very shrewd and incisive appreciation of the governing factors; and in his long tenure of office the sum of his work at the Press, or in connection with it, must be quite comparable to that which eminent private publishers find necessary for their business.

Those who knew him best had always a lively anticipation, when an entirely new subject came up, that it would be discovered to be 'Bywater's real speciality.' Once for the honour of the house and absolutely without notice he produced the most surprising stores of information upon the iconography of Italian saints: 'he gave me,' said the astonished iconographer who had started the subject, 'a new idea of what scholarship means. I must go away and work for years.' But everything human and real attracted him; and his prodigious accuracy and insight made him interesting to, as well as interested in, other people.

He was helped by exceptional physical health. There is nothing, so far as can be learnt by inquiry, in the doctrine of the *Athenaeum* and the *Sportsman*, that in youth he had been a distinguished cross-country runner. But almost to the last he could tax his constitution beyond the compass of common men. 'What,' he said to a young man who had 'no time' for some undertaking, 'do you do in the afternoons?' 'In the afternoons I go for a walk.' 'Walk!' said Bywater, 'it is true that a fortnight ago I had some business with Pelham, and walked with him, but I haven't been wantonly for a WALK for five and twenty years.' After a day's work he could sit for two or three hours at the Aristotelian Society, and after dialectic enough for most men, take up something else well on into the small hours, and yet be perfectly fresh in the morning. In virtue of this perfect health he had 'none of the querulous weaknesses of the delicate scholar, none of the vices of an over-taxed men-

tality, no literary jealousy or petty vanity[1].' 'A very shoddy book' he said of some new work upon one of his favourite subjects. 'Why don't you review it?' he was asked. But Bywater looked at the company with surprise. 'Does dog eat dog?' He had, of course, his likes and dislikes, and permitted his friends to know them. But there was never ill-nature in his most denunciatory term—'something of a coxcomb.' To the outer world his known attainments, and a certain reticence, made him a formidable figure: to his friends, and to any scholar who went to him for help, he gave of his best. If he offered the gift, or the loan, of a book, it was certain to come at the first opportunity. If he gave a general invitation, it was sure to be followed by a specific appointment. 'My time,' he would write, 'shall be yours after that hour.' If a question on a point of scholarship had been left unsolved in conversation, the answer came by letter with 'This is all I can make out at present.' It is said that without ever making enquiry he knew what books were wanting on the shelves of his friends, and when he left Oxford he distributed his duplicates according to their needs without mistake—Ast's lexicon to one, Pacius' Commentary to another, Gesner and Joecher to a third.

. In his own work his natural bent was for the most difficult tasks: Heraclitus the obscure, the much-thumbed Ethics, the spiny places of the *De Anima*, the Poetics vexed by a long line of commentators and partisans. Of his edition of this last the principal German review wrote: 'Wir haben kein ähnliches Buch, das wir bei der Seite stellen können.' Dry light, no doubt—'you must not expect from me,' he said, when the book was leaving the press, 'anything about Fine Art, for I don't think Aristotle said anything about it. I have looked it up in the dictionaries, and I see that the term is much later.' But what else is so *hübsch objectiv*, so closely appreciative of the *Sprachgebrauch*—the two terms which Bywater commonly quoted from the Germans—and what above all combines with so elaborate a knowledge of the tradition, Greek, Latin, Italian, French, German and English, an insight so serene into the logical sequence of the ideas? 'It would perhaps occur to you that

[1] L. R. Farnell, in *Oxford Magazine*, Jan. 25, 1915.

some passage was not so hard as you had remembered it, or that the meaning was slightly different and clearer. You looked close, and found that the punctuation had been altered[1].' And everywhere the same 'impression of great unsounded depths' of learning.

The verdict of those that know has long been passed upon his work. It stands high in the succession of the scholars of the Renaissance, and of our own great English names; and he made for himself, and put into the hands of others, a technical equipment which, when he began, was not easy to come by in Britain. In his own University he has left his mark deep in its Library and its Press, and in the general advancement of its learning: to his friends and to all who knew him, the memory of intellect of the keenest edge, of wide humanity, generosity and courtesy, of unswerving fidelity to friends and causes, and above all to the things of the mind.

C. CANNAN.

§ ii

I am asked to add to Mr Cannan's notice a few words on behalf of a wide class of persons—those who, engaged upon learned work, were accustomed to look to Bywater at all turns for help which only he could give and which he gave always ungrudgingly, whatever at any time his other preoccupations might be.

One of his main interests was the history of learning, and under that came the scholars of the Renaissance and all the diversity of their studies. When the Clarendon Press undertook an edition of the Letters of Erasmus, Bywater readily charged himself with the supervision of the book. This task might have been light if he had wished to spare himself: but he made it heavy by his thorough scrutiny of text and notes. Three volumes of 600 pages each passed under his eye, and came back sometimes with convincing emendations, sometimes

[1] Gilbert Murray, *Inaugural Lecture.*

with additions to the notes of sources that should have been cited—the publications of antiquarian societies, and once even a college magazine at Cambridge, or corrections in the forms of names or in the initials of German scholars. With his characteristic reserve he would say no word of praise or blame: but he could let his dissatisfaction be felt, if necessary, and he was unhesitating in esteeming work of which he approved.

Beside such literary help he delighted to converse with younger men on subjects which he had mastered and in which they were interested. When he had retired to his Kensington home, 93, Onslow Square, he had more freedom than before, and it was in the library which he had built up for himself that he loved to talk. His books were a wonderful sight, filling completely the walls of his study and an adjoining room; standing in cabinets in the drawing-room, the drawers of which were packed with folios, and overflowing into bookcases on the stairs and in bedrooms, where in washing one's hands one could survey long lines of volumes—the wisdom of fifty years ago—which now find themselves undeservedly on back shelves in libraries. Though many of his treasures were handsomely adorned, he set little store by bindings, except for their human connexion. He had a considerable number of de Thou's fine books, but he could also find some interest in the tasteless productions of a wealthy Mexican collector. He would set luncheon late, so as to allow for a morning's work at the British Museum; and then the afternoon would disappear while he talked, until it needed a run across the Park to catch an evening train home. Often the last glimpse of him was as he hung over the banisters to add a further point to something he had been saying.

If only one could remember his conversation! Nothing but the deliberate effort of a Boswell could have preserved it, and at the end of such a day there was not much energy left to the chronicler. Topic after topic came up, many of striking interest, and each drove its predecessor off the field. There was no rush of words, but an even flow, as the slight figure moved about the room, only breaking off to take up another book or to fill one of his many pipes. He was very light upon

his feet, and his points were often made with a quick turn and a half-bow. Some of his phrases dwell in the memory. 'He has to be considered,' he would say of some writer who had played his part in the history of learning and had missed from posterity his due. Sometimes, in moments of expansion, his intensive adverb would come out, pronounced with the slight lisp which Spaniards give to such names as Saragossa; 'a beastly rare book,' he would say of some treasure acquired at a high price. Once even was heard something which sounded like 'a beastly dear friend.' His interests in conversation were wide and human. He had mixed in a distinguished world, and had many anecdotes to tell—as of the occasion when he introduced Renan and Ruskin to one another as he was showing the former over the British Museum. Local antiquities attracted him too. He knew the past history of his part of London; and of Sidmouth, his wife's home in Devon, which he usually visited in the summer, he delighted to talk. It was rare that he spoke of himself. A few facts once about his upbringing in London, or a mention of his having been at one time a sub-Librarian in the Bodleian. When he was breaking up his house in Oxford, 6, Norham Gardens, he parted with a number of his books. At the end of a long day of selection he said to a friend: 'My moral being is fluttered. I have been turning over books that I have not handled for a long time, books that my father gave me, the best editions of their day.' Again, not long before his death he described himself as 'a very lonely person, the end of a family.' But he had no wish for any but silent sympathy. His reserve may be illustrated by the manner in which he produced a list of his books in 1911—*Elenchus librorum vetustiorum apud * * hospitantium.* In giving away a copy he wrote, characteristically: 'I am sending you a catalogue of old books, some of which are in your period. You will see that their present owner desires to remain *ἀνώνυμος*. I am on the point of buying—unless I resist the temptation—two volumes of Froben tracts'; and as postscript, 'I hope you will remember to let me know when you are likely to be in town.'

His books were not bought without method. For many

years he had had the intention that the best of them should pass to the Bodleian. Anything to do with Greek attracted him, as was to be expected. He had choice examples of famous volumes; but the only thing that he allowed himself to 'collect' was the early Greek books printed by Gourmont at Paris. Of these he was in the habit of sending details to Omont: as of his wider stores he made communications to Legrand. His conversation would range hither and thither as subjects came into his mind. There was usually some new acquisition to show; and then he would often recur to the great figures of scholarship to whom he seemed to have an attachment almost personal. One afternoon he dictated from memory a biography of Ant. Nebrissensis—a special favourite of his—gathered from incidental references in 'Antonio's' writings; rare books these, of which he had a large number. He liked to talk, too, of Erasmus and Scaliger, whose portraits hung over his mantelpiece. To the importance of bibliography he was keenly alive, and he realised the necessity of studying a book in its different stages of growth. One of the last books he bought for the Bodleian was an intermediate edition of Erasmus' notes on the New Testament, which the Library needs. In glancing through it he caught the word *νῖκος* suggested as an emendation, and this he instanced as an evidence of Erasmus' wide knowledge of Greek. He detected the difference between the two early editions of Hugo Eterianus, and procured the one which is not in the Library. The limits of time he had set himself in buying were overstepped in the case of publications important for earlier periods, such as Baluze's edition of the life of P. Castellanus, or Gabbema's collection of sixteenth-century letters. Other books of which he never tired were the *Scaligerana* and *Menagiana*: 'I put a volume in my bag when I am going away on a visit, and am not sure whether I shall find in the house any books I can read.'

Of travel he did not speak much, but he had a great affection for Spain. His interest in 'Antonio' had perhaps first led him there; and besides collecting Antonio's works he bought a great number of early Spanish books, such as are seldom found in northern libraries. He made his pilgrimage to

Alcala, but was unfortunate in having a gray day which showed the deserted colleges rather sadly. Other reminiscences were of his difficulty in buying a Homer at Madrid, when he wanted a book to keep him company during a visit to Toledo: or a story he would tell against himself, of a small child who bothered him with importunity in the shady walks that lead up to the Alhambra, and who to a hasty injunction to be off replied with the unexpected utterance, slowly delivered, 'I am not a fool: I am a good boy'—words recollected from contact with Gibraltar.

A postcard showing the Spanish College at Bologna dwelt long beside the clock in his study. 'Antonio' had been a student there, and he was interested too in another of its alumni, Sepulveda. He liked the many-quartered coats of arms which cover the title-pages of Spanish historical works as completely as the great shield which fills the west front of S. Magdalena's at Valladolid.

Amicus summus noster, his travelling days are done. But he has set a mark upon English scholarship which the present generation must keep from obliteration, and future readers in the Bodleian, when they order his books, will have opportunity to bless his name.

P. S. ALLEN.

Mr Bywater's gift to the Bodleian Library of the books registered in his printed *Elenchus* contains 3622 separate works; of which (for instance) 171 are entered under Aristotle, 39 under Galen, 44 under J. J. Scaliger, 37 under H. Stephanus, 26 under Fortunatus Licetus. 53 have De Thou's arms, and many contain marginalia or autographs of famous scholars. A *Commentatio de Anima* of Melanchthon (1540) has 'Francisci Rabelesi καὶ τῶν αὐτοῦ φίλων.' The Incunabula are 152, of which 31 are Greek; the books printed in the first half of the sixteenth century are 1159 (459 Greek), of which 414 are from Paris presses—41 from that of Gilles Gourmont. Considerable additions made to the collection since 1911 are not included in this list; which is taken from *The Bodleian Quarterly Record*, no. 4.

POLITICAL AND LEGAL ASPECTS OF THE TRIAL OF RABIRIUS.

Cicero's speech on behalf of Rabirius must have been delivered within a very few months of his triumphant defeat of the Rullan proposal in January 63 B.C. He alludes in his peroration to the repudiated scheme 'for parcelling out the world in general and the ager Campanus in particular,' while he contrasts in almost identical terms the entire absence of danger from abroad with the prevalence of domestic and intestine plots emanating from traitors and revolutionaries (conf. 12, 33 with de leg. agr. i, 9, 26). The early months indeed of this year were highly critical both for the popular party with Caesar and Crassus at its head and for the constitutional or senatorial party and Cicero, who was doing his best to sustain the not easy part of 'consul popularis.' In view of the overwhelming position of Pompey in the East and his impending return, it was essential for Caesar and Crassus both to secure for themselves some locus standi in the empire, and to hold together their followers by the allurement of some kind of popular programme. That Caesar was already looked to by the populares as their real head seems clear, but he was still in an early stage of his cursus honorum, and therefore needed the official and magisterial assistance of others. For the year 63 he had, it appears probable, originally counted not only on a college of tribunes mainly devoted to himself, but also on two consuls in the persons of Antonius and Catiline ready to carry through any programme he might dictate. These plans were partly disconcerted by the consular elections in the summer of 64, and instead of having his selected candidates to work with, he found himself confronted by Cicero, who, in whatever

sense a 'consul popularis,' was known to be at once Pompeian and senatorial in his sympathies. Caesar therefore had to do the best he could with the instruments at his command.

I have already in a previous number of this Journal (No. 64) discussed the policy of the Rullan proposal. I regarded it as an audacious piece of Caesarian legislation, intended as a real and popular agrarian scheme by which colonies, at once for poor citizens and in the future for old soldiers, were to be provided, but at the same time securing for Caesar and his allies a commanding position in many provinces and in Egypt, and by audacious financial innovations establishing a huge fund, primarily for agrarian purposes, but available, if occasion arose, for ulterior ends. But owing to his failure to secure influential magisterial agents, Caesar had entrusted the carrying of this weighty measure to one of his tribunes, a man of no reputation, and whose name commanded no confidence. This, as it turned out, was a grave tactical mistake, and caused the ignominious defeat of the scheme, for it gave Cicero a safe opportunity for two of his most telling accomplishments, unscrupulous misrepresentation and outrageous insinuation, used with perfect impunity against a nonentity like Rullus.

Meanwhile Caesar still needed a rallying cry to unite the populares against the senatorial government which the new consul was known to favour, and with which it was not impossible that Pompey on his return might ally himself.

The domestic situation in Rome was probably very complicated in this critical year. It can hardly be doubted that, though there was as yet no 'Catilinarian conspiracy,' there was a good deal of vague and restless expectation among a certain class in the capital of impending revolutionary changes. This may have been produced or encouraged by incautious and unauthorised expressions let fall by Catiline in his candidature for the consulship about the need for 'novae tabulae' and other drastic measures against the selfish rich. Sallust has no doubt antedated the existence of a definite plot, but in the early months of 63 there were indications of coming trouble, clearly alluded to by Cicero in the words "a turbulentis hominibus atque novarum rerum cupidis ab intestinis malis a domesticis

consiliis cavendum est" (pro Rab. 12, 33) and as certainly not unknown to Caesar. Whether the candidature of Catiline was still favoured by the latter is uncertain, but Caesar must have realised the probability of serious disturbances in the event of another disappointment. He must have foreseen too that to meet them the senate would pass the senatus consultum ultimum, and that Cicero, consul popularis as he might be, would be at least as prepared to carry it into effect as Marius had been to act against Saturninus and his followers in 100 B.C. Cicero indeed made no secret of what he would do. "Facerem idem quod C. Marius fecit, ad senatum referrem, vos ad rem publicam defendendam cohortarer, armatus ipse vobiscum armato obsisterem" (pro Rab. 12, 34).

But to Caesar the possibility of any return on the part of the senate to the methods employed in the tribuneship of Saturninus must have been disquieting. For whatever views he may have held on the constitutional legality of the senatus consultum ultimum, he would be in any case averse to its employment at the present time as likely to increase that influence and prestige of the senate which it was the 'popular' policy to depress. Should disturbances take place later in the year, and should they be suppressed, as those of Saturninus had been, by the senate and consul, the result would be a serious set-back, if not a fatal disaster, to the popular party.

It was in the midst of these embarrassments caused alike by his recent defeat and the prospect of complications to come that Caesar hit upon the idea which developed into the much discussed trial of Rabirius for *perduellio*.

Suetonius and Dio Cassius shall give their somewhat meagre statements of what took place. "(Caesar) subornavit etiam qui Caio Rabirio perduellionis diem diceret, quo praecipuo adiutore aliquot ante annos Luci Saturnini tribunatum senatus coercuerat." (Caes. 12.) *Τίτος δὲ δὴ Λαβιῆνος Γάιον Ῥαβίριον ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ Σατουρνίνου φόνῳ γραψάμενος πλεῖστόν σφισι τάραχον παρέσχεν. ὅ τε γὰρ Σατουρνῖνος πρὸ ἓξ που καὶ τριάκοντα ἐτῶν ἐτεθνήκει· καὶ τὰ κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον τὸν πρὸς αὐτὸν οἱ ὕπατοι τότε παρὰ τῆς βουλῆς προσετετάχατο.* (xxxvii. 26.) That the initiative was due to Caesar is care-

fully kept out of sight throughout Cicero's speech, but is definitely asserted by Suetonius, and is hardly less clearly brought out by the words of Dio, *καὶ ἐπειδὴ τοῦτο διά τε τὸν Καίσαρα καὶ δι' ἄλλους τινὰς ἐνίκησε*. It appears from these passages and from statements of Cicero that Rabirius, now an elderly senator of some property and standing, had 37 years before, when a young man and an *eques*, not only joined in suppressing Saturninus, as Suetonius states, but was said actually to have killed him with his own hand. Cicero like Dio states this explicitly: "arguis occisum esse a C. Rabirio L. Saturninum." (pro Rab. 6, 18.) Whatever explanation of his act may be forthcoming, there can be no doubt that it was Caesar's plan of meeting his difficulties to have Rabirius brought to trial for this political murder committed 37 years before. That his object was a political one, and Rabirius a mere man of straw, is of course obvious. It was, I imagine, a double object; to raise a popular cry by vindicating the 'unicum libertatis praesidium,' set at naught by the slaughter of Saturninus without trial and without appeal, and at the same time, not indeed to assail the validity of the senatus consultum ultimum itself, but so to expose certain illegalities which had been covered by its supposed sanction, as to discredit a procedure capable of such abuses.

It has usually been held by modern historians that Caesar on this occasion was challenging the legal or constitutional basis of the senatus consultum ultimum, and that it was the standpoint of the popular party all through this period to contest the validity of the senate's action in passing this decree. There seems to me to be no reason whatever either for attributing this attitude to the party, or for finding in Caesar's indictment of Rabirius a covert attack on the legality of the 'last decree.' It is true that Opimius had been brought to trial for killing Roman citizens on the strength of the senate's decree, and Decius, perhaps representing the popular party, had declared that nothing could justify the slaying of a citizen without trial and appeal. But the people had accepted the arguments of Opimius and his advocates, and by their acquittal had legally sanctioned his action, and with it the validity of

the senatorial decree. There is every indication that the popular leaders down to the end of the Republic loyally accepted this decision, though regarding this new senatorial prerogative with some suspicion, and insisting that what the people had ratified as the legal sequel to a senatus consultum ultimum was action in strict conformity to that of Opimius. If therefore there was a state of war in the city, and riotous citizens with arms in their hands threatened the safety of the state, the senate was justified in passing its decree, bidding the consuls see, 'ne quid respublica detrimenti caperet.' The consuls were then justified in 'calling the people to arms,' putting themselves at its head, and carrying into effect the state of war. It followed that all riotous citizens who were killed by members of this armed force acting under the consuls' order, lost their lives as overt enemies of the state—*perduelles*—so that neither the Sempronian law requiring trial by the people, nor the Porcian law requiring appeal, was applicable to the case.

In this sense the validity of the senatus consultum ultimum is emphatically asserted by Sallust, who notoriously wrote from the standpoint of the popular party. "Itaque, quod plerumque in atroci negotio solet, senatus decrevit darent operam consules ne quid respublica detrimenti caperet. Ea potestas per senatum more Romano magistratibus maxima permittitur, exercitum parare, bellum gerere, coercere omnibus modis socios atque cives (i.e. of course those acting as enemies), domi militiaeque imperium atque iudicium summum habere; aliter sine populi iussu nullius earum rerum consuli ius est." (Sall. Cat. 29.)

Still more decisive are two carefully worded pronouncements of Caesar himself. "Decurritur ad illud extremum atque ultimum senatus consultum quo nisi paene in ipso urbis incendio atque in desperatione omnium salutis et in summa sceleratorum audacia nunquam ante descensum est; dent operam consules praetores tribuni plebis quique pro consulibus sint ad urbem, ne quid respublica detrimenti capiat." (Bell. civ. i, 5.) Again and still more explicitly: "Quotienscunque sit decretum darent operam magistratus ne quid respublica

detrimenti caperet, qua voce et quo senatus consulto populus Romanus ad arma sit vocatus, factum in perniciosis legibus, in vi tribunicia, in secessione populi, templis locisque editioribus occupatis; atque haec superioris aetatis exempla expiata Saturnini atque Gracchorum casibus docet." (Bell. civ. i, 7.) These deliberate utterances were made not more than 14 or 15 years after 63; there is no reason whatever to think that Caesar had changed his views, and, if he had not, these passages prove that he did not question either the validity of the senatus consultum ultimum, or the legality of the acts which followed it, provided that there was violence, civil war and danger to the state, and that any acts of war to avert these dangers were directed by the responsible magistrates. Caesar's words are exactly applicable to the action of Opimius in 121 and of Marius in 100, the justification of which indeed in both cases is expressly admitted.

It seems to me therefore quite impossible to maintain that Caesar's political object in instituting this trial was to attack the validity of the senatus consultum ultimum as a means of dealing with revolutionary emergencies. This is however undoubtedly the impression which Cicero's speech conveys and was intended to convey to the Roman people. He sounds this note at the very outset. His task is primarily that of a consul, only secondarily that of an advocate, for the real object of the impeachment is not to endanger the life of Rabirius, but "ut illud summum auxilium maiestatis atque imperi quod nobis a maioribus est traditum de republica tolleretur, ut nihil posthac auctoritas senatus, nihil consulare imperium, nihil consensio bonorum contra pestem ac perniciem civitatis valeret." (pro Rab. 1, 2.) Again: "agitur enim nihil aliud in hac causa, Quirites, nisi ut sit nullum posthac in republica publicum consilium, nulla bonorum consensio contra improborum furorem et audaciam, nullum extremis reipublicae temporibus perfugium ac praesidium salutis." (ib. 2, 4.) To the same effect in his peroration: "Hisce autem malis magnum vobis praesidium maiores vestri reliquerunt, vocem illam consulis 'qui rempublicam salvam esse vellent.' Huic voci favete, Quirites, neque vestro iudicio abstuleritis mihi.....neque eripueritis

reipublicae spem libertatis, spem salutis, spem dignitatis." (ib. 12, 33.)

That this view of Caesar's motive should have come to be accepted by historians like Dio Cassius is the natural result of the publication and preservation of Cicero's speech. So we find Dio declaring that as a result of the impeachment ἡ γερουσία ἄκυρος...τῶν ψηφισμάτων ἐγίγνετο, and that it was highly indignant ὅτι τὸ πρόσχημα τῆς πολιτείας διεβάλλετο. I have tried to show in connexion with the agrarian proposal earlier in the year how dangerous it is to accept Cicero's evaluation of political motives and political situations without the most careful criticism. In the present case, I believe that we may find an intelligible motive for Caesar's action without having to attribute to him any change of attitude on the subject of the senatus consultum ultimum.

The charge against Rabirius was that he had killed Saturninus. The fact was denied, and it was even asserted that a slave had long since been rewarded for having done the deed. The point, even if true, is not conclusive, for Saturninus was killed by missiles from above, and Rabirius and the slave may both have hit their mark, though only one claimed the reward. A story retailed by the author of *de vir. illustr.* represents Rabirius as carrying the head of Saturninus about (de vir. ill. 73), but after 37 years there was much room for doubt. Cicero is very little concerned with the question of fact. He denies it, but wishes that it were true (pro Rab. 6, 18), and in any case all would obviously depend on the exact circumstances of the act. These were differently reported by later writers. The epitomator of Livy (lxix), Velleius (ii, 12), and Dio Cassius (loc. cit.), all speak as if Saturninus was killed in what was virtually open war between him and an armed force commanded by Marius the consul. We shall see too that Cicero's whole case rested on this assumption. This however was not the only version of the final act of the drama, but as to the earlier stages there is no dispute. Saturninus and Glaucia with their followers were behaving like public enemies. They had not only murdered Memmius, a candidate for the consulship, but had seized the Capitol with an armed force (pro Rab. 6, 20).

On this "fit senatus consultum ut C. Marius L. Valerius consules adhiberent tribunos pl. et praetores, quos eis videretur, operamque darent ut imperium populi Romani maiestasque conservaretur...qui rempublicam salvam esse vellent arma capere et se sequi iubent....Arma populo Romano Mario consule distribuente dantur" (ib. 7, 20). Cicero slightly paraphrases the formula to emphasize his point that the consuls were commissioned to save the state, but otherwise his account must be accepted as correct. Among those so armed and led by Marius, including senators and *equites* and indeed all loyal citizens, Rabirius was admittedly one. "Confiteor interficiendi Saturnini causa C. Rabirium arma cepisse" (ib. 6, 19). More than that, if he had accomplished his object, "id pulcherrimum facinus esse arbitrarer." We may at once admit that, on the precedent of Opimius and according to Caesar's own pronouncement, if the Capitol had been stormed, as it was in 69 A.D., and if in the fighting Rabirius had met and killed Saturninus, Cicero's argument would be final: "si arma iure sumpta concedis, interfectum iure concedas necesse est." But the Capitol was not stormed, and Saturninus did not meet his death there at all. Most accounts agree that he was killed in the senate house. Perhaps he escaped there when the water pipes of the Capitol were cut, and was there attacked and killed by the consul's armed bands. If so, Cicero's argument would still apply. But there was another version as to how Saturninus found himself in the senate house, and how he met his death there. According to Florus what happened after the seizure of the Capitol was this: "Sed cum abruptis fistulis obsideretur, senatuique per legatos paenitentiae fidem faceret, ab arce degressus cum ducibus factionis receptus in curiam est. Ibi eum facta inruptione populus fustibus saxisque coopertum in ipsa quoque morte laceravit" (Flor. ii, 4). Appian gives further details. *καὶ αὐτοὺς τῆς βουλῆς ἀναιρεθῆναι ψηφισαμένης, ὁ Μάριος ἀχθόμενος ὅμως ὤπλιζέ τινας σὺν ὄκνῳ· καὶ βραδύνοντος ἕτεροι τὸ ὕδωρ ἐπιρρέον ἐς τὸ ἱερὸν διέτεμον. καὶ Σαυφήιος μὲν ἐμπρῆσαι τὸν νεών, ὑπὸ δίψης ἀπολύμενος, ἠξίου, Γλαυκίας δὲ καὶ Ἀπουλήιος ἐλπίσαντες αὐτοῖς ἐπικουρήσειν Μάριον παρέδωκαν ἑαυτούς, οἵδε πρῶτοι, καὶ ἐπ' ἐκείνοις ὁ Σαυφήιος. Μάριος*

δ', αὐτίκα πάντων αὐτοὺς ἀναιρεῖν κελευόντων, ἐς τὸ βουλευτήριον συνέκλεισεν ὡς ἐννομώτερον ἐργασόμενος. οἱ δὲ πρόφασιν τοῦτ' εἶναι νομίσαντες, τὸν κέραμον ἐξέλυον τοῦ βουλευτηρίου, καὶ τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὸν Ἀπουλήιον ἔβαλλον ἕως ἀπέκτειναν, ταμίαν τε καὶ δήμαρχον καὶ στρατηγόν (bell. civ. i, 32).

From these passages it would appear that Saturninus made terms of surrender with Marius, who conducted him under a safe-escort to the *curia*, and guarded him there, intending, according to Appian, to proceed against him in legal form. It was thus while he was an unarmed prisoner in the senate house that the people, and among them Rabirius if he really killed Saturninus, put an end to him with stones and tiles. But if this was the true version, or the version which, true or false, Caesar chose to adopt, the affair bore an entirely different complexion from that put upon it by Cicero, and there is no longer any justification for regarding Caesar's impeachment of Rabirius as a veiled attack on the legality of the senatus consultum ultimum. In the first place, Saturninus on surrendering and being made prisoner had ceased to be an open *perduellis* in arms against the state, whose safety demanded his instant death. This was recognised by Marius, who set guards to keep the prisoners safe for subsequent trial. In the second place, Rabirius was on this showing not acting under the consul's order at all. On the contrary, he acted against them, eluding the consul's guards, and killing those whom the consul wished to preserve. Such a murder was not authorised by the consul, and was therefore not authorised by the senatus consultum which alone gave him his mandate. It was in fact a political assassination committed by an irresponsible individual in defiance of the wishes, orders and precautions of the consul.

It may be argued that this version, being found only in these late writers, deserves no serious attention. I notice however that scholars who are most emphatic in styling Appian a third-rate compiler are ready enough to support their own theories by the most casual expressions found in this contemptible source. But in the present case we have the inadvertent evidence of Cicero himself, not of course for the truth of the story, but for its existence at the time, and its

adoption by the prosecution. It is one of our obvious disadvantages that, while we have the main speech for the defence, we have no statement of the case for the prosecution. It is perfectly obvious that the point whether a guarantee of safety was or was not given to Saturninus by the consul, was crucial to the case, and must have had a prominent place in the speeches of Labienus. It has no such prominent place in Cicero's defence because it was an awkward point, and because an elaborate *ignoratio elenchi* was the best means of meeting it. But it could not be wholly passed over, and therefore after the sonorous but irrelevant question, 'if Rabirius deserves the cross and the executioner, what does the consul deserve under whose orders he acted?' he makes his sole reference to the point. "Ac si fides Saturnino data est, quod abs te saepissime dicitur, non eam C. Rabirius sed C. Marius dedit, idemque violavit, si in fide non stetit. Quae fides, Labiene, qui potuit sine senatus consulto dari?" (pro Rab. 10, 28). It appears therefore from the words 'quod abs te saepissime dicitur' that this point about the guarantee, only intelligible on the version of Appian and Florus, was persistently urged by Labienus. Cicero has two replies to it, both as illogical as they were audacious. (1) A guarantee given by Marius did not bind Rabirius. (2) Marius had no right to give the guarantee without a special decree of the senate. But if Rabirius was not bound by the consul's decision, what becomes of Cicero's reiterated argument that Rabirius should have been safe from attack just because, like all good men, he had joined the consuls, had received his arms from the hands of Marius, had not refused 'voci atque imperio consulum oboedire,' had been among those 'qui consulari imperio paruerunt,' and had acted on the conviction that 'virtus et honestas et pudor cum consulibus esse cogebat'? It seems there was a fourth alternative besides the three laid down by Cicero of doing nothing, or joining Saturninus or following the consuls. There was the course of irresponsible lynching, and that according to Labienus and Caesar was the course which Rabirius took. Again, if Marius had no right to give the guarantee without a senatorial decree, Cicero commits himself to the hopeless paradox that the

senatus consultum ultimum, while it authorised the consul to kill armed enemies, did not authorise him to abstain from killing men who were no longer armed enemies. No wonder that the orator hastened from the point to a disquisition on the immortality of great men (ib. 10, 29). It is to be hoped that Labienus had made his points with sufficient clearness to expose beforehand the irrelevant sophisms with which Cicero met the alleged facts. "If you admit that Rabirius had the right to take up arms, you must admit that he had the right to kill Saturninus" (ib. 6, 19). "If Rabirius has committed a capital crime in taking up arms against Saturninus, what is to be said of all those noble patriots who did the same, and could not be, as he might have been, excused on the score of youth?" (ib. 9, 26). "If a cross is to be set up in the Campus for Rabirius because he took up arms, what punishment can be devised for the consul who called him to arms?" (ib. 10, 29). "There is not a loyal citizen in Rome to-day, who is not in the name of Rabirius the subject of a capital charge" (ib. 11, 31). These arguments are in Cicero's best style, but they dishonestly ignore the fact that, according to the prosecution, Rabirius had not been one of the loyal citizens obeying the consul, but one of the irresponsible crowd which had defied his orders.

It was the circulation of this story about Rabirius, whether true or false, which, after the defeat of the Rullan scheme, suggested to Caesar his next move. Here was a case of political murder, (the victim having been not only a Roman citizen but a tribune of the plebs,) which had remained unnoticed and unpunished for 37 years, during which the reputed murderer had acquired wealth and position. The murder was not exactly a violation of the lex Porcia, for it had not been punishment inflicted by a magistrate; but, on the other hand, it had not been sanctioned by the senatus consultum ultimum, for the victim was a prisoner at the time of his death, being guarded by the consul with a view to future trial. It therefore made no difference that the murdered tribune had been an armed enemy of the state, for he had been disarmed and rendered harmless, and could have been dealt with according to due forms of law. Both the nature of the crime and the long

impunity of the criminal demanded from the popular party some extraordinary vindication of the law. Besides, the possibility of such a crime as that of Rabirius suggested grave reflections. It was not the direct result of the extreme senatorial decree, that indeed would have been its sole justification, but it nevertheless could hardly have happened unless that decree had been passed. Without assailing the validity of the method adopted in critical emergencies by the senate, it was essential to the interests of the popular party that two things should be made quite clear. (1) On the sole legally established precedent only armed and active enemies could be killed by the consul and his band. This had not been contravened in 100, but it would have been if Marius after imprisoning Saturninus had executed him, and it might be contravened in future. (2) If the legitimate 'consensio bonorum' degenerated into irresponsible lynching, the government must be held responsible at least to the extent of being bound to see that such incidental effects of their own decree did not go unpunished. Otherwise, under the vague aegis of the last decree all sorts of illegal and riotous acts might creep in. This is how in my opinion the political object of this famous trial may be expressed. It was calculated to rally the popular party round the 'unicum libertatis praesidium'; it threw some slur on the senatorial government which had allowed thirty-seven years' impunity to a lawless and inexcusable murder, and it sounded a significant note of warning, clearly not lost upon Cicero, against careless application of martial law by senate or consuls, or failure to punish regrettable or illegal incidents.

It must be admitted that this idea of rallying his party by a political impeachment, though not without signs of Caesar's characteristic adroitness and resource, was a little far-fetched and *en faute de mieux*. But the legal methods by which the impeachment was to be carried through were still more open to criticism. There was perhaps something, in the exceptional circumstances of the case, to be said for resorting to an impeachment for *perduellio* rather than to an ordinary accusation in the *quaestio de vi* or *de sicariis*. (The distinction is marked by Dio cap. 27: *οὐ γὰρ ἁπλῶς, ἀλλὰ τὸ δὴ λεγόμενον περδου-*

ελλίωνος ὁ Ῥαβίριος ἐκρίθη.) It is true that such a procedure was something of a survival, but it was still legal and subject to fixed and well-known regulations. But it was not the historical process of *perduellio* which Caesar determined to adopt. He wished to make a more striking and impressive appeal to the popular imagination. It was with this view that the fantastic idea shaped itself of reviving for the occasion the barbarous and obsolete procedure ascribed by tradition to the famous trial of Horatius under the kings. The king had appointed *duumviri perduellionis* to pass sentence in his stead in the words, 'iudico tibi perduellionem.' From this there was an appeal to the people, before whom a *certatio* followed between the condemned and the *duumviri*. If the latter won, the formula prescribed: "caput obnubito; infelici arbore reste suspendito." I have argued elsewhere that there is no evidence and as little probability that the *duumviri* or the *carnifex* or the *arbor infelix* ever figured again in trials for *perduellio*. The barbarous and realistic exhibition had given place under the Republic to a tribunician prosecution in three stages, followed in case of condemnation by an appeal to the comitia centuriata after 24 days' interval. If this normal course had been adopted, there would have been no room for senatorial opposition, and no need for action by the people. The tribune would simply have fixed a day (diem dicere) for Rabirius to appear before his tribunal. Suetonius supposes that Labienus did this, but the other authorities prove that he is wrong (loc. cit. "qui C. Rabirio perduellionis diem diceret"). But for the Horatian procedure there was no constitutional machinery in existence, and nothing could be done without legislation.

The agent employed by Caesar, who no doubt as in the agrarian proposal remained in the background, was T. Labienus, one of the tribunes. He was possibly selected because an uncle of his had lost his life with Saturninus in the *curia*. On the promulgation of the scheme there was much consternation and confusion, *σπουδαὶ ταραχώδεις καὶ φιλονεικίαι*. The popular and anti-senatorial motive was apparent: *οἱ δήμαρχοι τήν τε ἰσχὺν καὶ τὴν ἀξίωσιν τῆς βουλῆς καταλῦσαι παντελῶς ἐσπούδαζον καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἑαυτοῖς τοῦ πάνθ' ὅσα βούλοιντο ποιεῖν*

προπαρεσκεύαζον (D. C. xxxvii, 26). It was almost certainly represented from the first as a thinly veiled attack upon the senatus consultum ultimum, so that πᾶς ὁ κόσμος τῆς πολιτείας ἐταράττετο. We are told by Dio Cassius in a passage far from clear (cap. 27) that there were two great contests, first περὶ τοῦ δικαστηρίου, i.e. whether it should be established or not, and, when that point was won by Caesar and his friends, secondly περὶ τῆς κρίσεως.

The first struggle centred round the law which was necessary to bring the duumviral procedure into existence. In the Horatian trial all had rested on the fiat of the king; it now had to emanate from the sovereign people. Accordingly Labienus must have promulgated a bill, providing for the appointment of *duumviri perduellionis*, prescribing the form of sentence to be pronounced, and specifying the gruesome punishment in rigid accordance with the 'horrendum carmen' handed down from the barbarous legend of kingly days. Cicero's allusions to the action of Labienus seem to leave no room for doubt on this point. "Quam ob rem uter nostrum, Labiene, popularis est, tune qui civibus Romanis in contione ipsa carnificem...adhibere putas oportere, qui in campo Martio comitiis centuriatis auspicato in loco crucem ad civium supplicium defigi...iubes etc." (pro Rab. 4, 11). "Tu, homo lenis ac popularis, libentissime commemoras: CAPUT OBNUBITO; ARBORI INFELICI SUSPENDITO; quae verba, Quirites, iam pridem...luce libertatis oppressa sunt" (ib. 4, 13). So, contrasting the method of C. Gracchus in impeaching Popilius with that of Labienus: "Sed moreretur prius acerbissima morte miliens C. Gracchus quam in eius contione carnifex consisteret" (ib. 4, 15). "Si C. Rabirio quod iit ad arma crucem T. Labienus in campo Martio defigendam putavit etc." (ib. 10, 28). I could quote other passages, but these are surely enough to prove that the trial was to be in every detail a replica of the Horatian. That this extraordinary court was brought into existence by Labienus is clear both from passages already quoted and from such an expression as the following: "accusatio perniciosa, iudicium acerbum, res tota a tribuno pl. suscepta contra rempublicam" (ib. 12, 35). As tribune, he could only have done it by legislation, and it

was during the *contiones* between the promulgation and passing of the law that the violent contests περὶ τοῦ δικαστηρίου took place. I understand that the carnifex and crux said by Cicero to have been brought into his *contio* by Labienus did not appear there in flesh and blood or wood and iron, but only figured in his speeches as having a place in his law. Whether after the sentence of the *duumviri* a cross was actually set up in the campus Martius is another matter which I may notice below.

Among the contents of the law must have been the appointment of, and mandate given to, the *duumviri perduellionis*. Their title is not mentioned by Suetonius nor by Dio, though the latter speaks of the two Caesars as judges. Cicero however in a passage soon to be quoted distinctly does so (ib. 3, 12). Dio speaks of them as μὴ πρὸς τοῦ δήμου, κατὰ τὰ πάτρια, ἀλλὰ πρὸς αὐτοῦ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ, οὐκ ἐξὸν, αἱρεθέντες. Suetonius speaks of Caesar as 'iudex in reum sorte ductus.' It has been inferred from this, and I have nothing better to suggest, that the praetor urbanus selected a certain number from categories not to be specified, and that from these two were appointed by lot. (One suggestion is that the lot simply decided which of the *duumviri* should pass sentence, but the words 'iudex in reum' are against this.) Whether the lot which fell upon C. and L. Caesar was tampered with must remain uncertain, but I prefer to think that Caesar would have chosen to remain in the background, and that his selection was pure bad luck. Dio's statement that the proper mode of appointment was popular election has no value whatever. There is absolutely no evidence that *duumviri perduellionis* had ever been called into existence under the Republic, and everything points to their being employed now as mere constituents of the legendary model.

As to their mandate, I have no doubt whatever. They were not to try the case, but to pass the gruesome and awe-inspiring sentence. This was clearly all that the archetypal *duumviri* had had to do in the case of Horatius. It also explains, what Suetonius did not understand, the apparent haste of Caesar's condemnation. But what Cicero says of

Labienus places the matter beyond a doubt: "hic popularis a IIviris iniussu vestro non iudicari de cive Romano sed indicta causa civem Romanum capitis condemnari coegit" (ib. 4, 12) The phrases—non iudicari sed condemnari—indicta causa—coegit—are surely as conclusive as words can make anything. As a matter of fact, the duumviral *iudicium* was merely intended as a means to render possible the solemn decision of the comitia centuriata. There must have been a special clause in the law providing for *provocatio*, for otherwise an extraordinary court set up by the people would place in abeyance the operation of the *leges Valeriae*.

This then was the struggle *περὶ τοῦ δικαστηρίου, τῶν μὲν ὅπως μὴ συναχθῇ, τῶν δὲ ἵνα καθιζήσῃ δικαιούντων*, which was concluded in favour of the tribune *διά τε τὸν Καίσαρα καὶ δι' ἄλλους τινὰς* (D. C. xxxvii, 27). The *duumviri*, having been constituted, would naturally lose no time in performing their allotted task. Suetonius says that Caesar "tam cupide condemnavit ut ad populum provocanti nihil aeque ac iudicis acerbitas profuerit." Cicero emphatically declares that the condemnation was compulsory and 'indicta causa.' The sentence was in the formula: "iudico tibi, C. Rabiri, perduellionem." What this meant had been foreshadowed in the wording of the law, taken, as Cicero proves, from the 'horrendum carmen' of the archetypal trial. It seems to me not improbable that, when the sentence was pronounced, Labienus may have caused the *crux* or *arbor infelix* to be actually erected on the campus Martius in preparation for the final hearing before the people. Whatever might be the outcome of that hearing, this would have the effect, presumably aimed at by Caesar, of impressing the popular imagination by these relics of obsolete barbarity. No doubt the words "crucem in campo Martio defigendam putavit" may signify no more than an intention, but I am inclined to refer them to a perpetrated outrage.

It is at this point, as I believe, that we reach the second struggle in the case, marked by Dio's words *περί τε τῆς κρίσεως αὖθις συνέβησαν*. Dio does not himself explain the nature of this struggle, and seems to imply that the dispute concerned the mode in which the *duumviri* had been appointed, but more

light is thrown upon it by Cicero. It had seemed a happy idea to disinter an obsolete procedure with its impressive but inhuman punishments, whereby to safeguard the primary rights of Roman citizens. But it proved to be an error of judgment. Such methods were contrary to the spirit of the free Republic; they were a violation, if not of statute law, at least of long established *mos maiorum*. If a crime was so heinous as to fall under the head of 'perduellio,' a recognised legal procedure had grown up, in which no extraordinary officials were required, and in which a capital sentence, never likely to be carried out, was decently veiled in the formula of 'aquae et igni interdictio.' It might well be represented as a strange and dubious policy for a 'popular' tribune acting for a 'popular' party, to derive his legal precedents from the cruel and hated age of kingly rule.

It was just the situation which gave Cicero the chance of posing for a moment as a 'consul popularis.' The actual course which he took, though several times alluded to and gloried in, is never clearly stated in his extant speech. In some way and in some sense he cancelled or quashed the 'perduellionis iudicium,' and his action was bitterly complained of by Labienus. "Nam de perduellionis iudicio, quod a me sublatum esse criminari soles,...utinam, Quirites, ego id aut primus aut solus ex hac republica sustulissem....Quid enim optari potest quod ego mallem quam me in consulatu meo carnificem de foro, crucem de campo sustulisse?" (pro Rab. 3, 10). He explains that his agency was secondary to that of the *mos maiorum*, which since the expulsion of the kings had tolerated "nullum in libero populo vestigium crudelitatis regiae," and to that of previous statesmen, who had substituted equitable laws for barbarous penalties. In another passage he is more ready to take the credit to himself: "quam ob rem fateor atque etiam, Labiene, profiteor et prae me fero te ex illa crudeli, importuna, non tribunicia actione sed regia meo consilio, virtute, auctoritate esse depulsum" (ib. 5, 17).

These statements can only mean that the whole machinery, based upon this antiquated precedent, which Caesar and Labienus had contrived, was somehow rendered null and void

by Cicero's intervention. This intervention is connected by some scholars with Dio's first struggle *περὶ τοῦ δικαστηρίου* and Cicero is thought simply to have pruned away from the bill of Labienus all traces of the 'carmen horrendum,' and to have substituted for the grisly death on the 'arbor infelix' the ordinary capital sentence of 'aquae et igni interdictio.' It seems to me impossible to accept this view. Such a change in the law would have at the outset so completely baulked Caesar's object, if that object was what I have suggested, that he would have caused the bill to be withdrawn. There was nothing impressive or awe-inspiring in the appointment of *duumviri* or in listening to the ordinary sentence which would be now all that they could pass. And yet nothing but this would have been left, if Cicero had brought about the supposed excision. It would have been simpler and even more impressive to fall back on the usual tribunician impeachment. The *duumviri* were only important as having figured in the ancient trial, and if the kernel of that trial was extracted, it was futile to keep the shell. But, as we know, from both Suetonius and Dio, the law was proceeded with, the *duumviri* were appointed and passed their sentence.

I argue therefore from the probabilities of the case, as well as from the phrase itself, 'perduellionis iudicium sublatum,' that Cicero's intervention followed rather than preceded the duumviral trial and sentence, and that both were rendered by it invalid, null and void, legally extinct.

Now the grounds on which Cicero based his intervention, his official intervention as consul, may be gathered from his own words, and the method, by which it was brought about, is also, I think, to be inferred from statements made by himself. The methods of the duumviral trial were "non solum tenebris vetustatis verum etiam luce libertatis oppressa" (4, 14). They had "nullam partem aequitatis aut iuris" (ib.). They were "non ex memoria vestra ac patrum vestrorum, sed ex annalium monumentis atque ex regum commentariis conquisita" (4, 15). They were things of which "mentio ipsa indigna cive Romano et homine libero est" (5, 16). Lastly, they prove neglect of "omnia exempla maiorum, omnes leges, omnem auctoritatem

senatus, omnes religiones atque auspiciorum publica iura" (5, 17). Making therefore every allowance for rhetorical expressions, we can hardly doubt that the law on which *perduellionis iudicium* had depended was contrary to the whole spirit of Roman legislation, and in a sense of the Roman religion. If so, it was Cicero's 'consulare officium' to protect the Republic against such an outrage. There was only one way of doing this, and that was through the intervention of the senate. We know from several undisputed examples that when laws were passed 'per vim' or 'contra auspicia,' or in any way which constituted them 'vitiosae,' the senate, whether its action was *de facto* or *de iure*, was in the habit of passing a decree, "populum Romanum ea lege non teneri." This had been done in the case of the Apuleian laws in 100, and of the Livian laws in 91 B.C., on which occasions in Cicero's words these laws were cancelled and became null and void 'uno versiculo senatus.' I have argued elsewhere that the same course was taken by the consul Marcellus in 51 B.C. with regard to the lex Vatinia, by which Caesar had established a colony at Comum. This power was obviously a useful adjunct of senatorial government, and was, I suspect, when the circumstances were favourable, not unfrequently employed. That the cancelling of the duumviral trial—perduellionis iudicium sublatum—was due to the senate's action on Cicero's initiative is, I think, made in the highest degree probable by what Cicero says a year or two later in his speech against Piso: "ego in Rabirio perduellionis reo interpositam senatus auctoritatem sustinui contra invidiam atque defendi" (in Pison. 2, 4).

I may notice a possible objection to the view that Labienus established the duumviral court by a law, derived from the words 'iniussu vestro' in the passage 3, 12 quoted above. Cicero is contrasting Labienus with C. Gracchus. The latter had prohibited any capital *iudicium*, which was not created by law (iniussu vestro). Labienus is responsible for the compulsory condemnation of a Roman citizen, without a trial and 'iniussu vestro.' How 'iniussu vestro,' if a law was passed? The phrase is only a difficulty, if it qualifies 'coegit.' It seems to me from its position after 'a duumviris' to qualify 'con-

demnari.' A tribune in his *contio* would never condemn without some sign of approval from the assembled people, but the *duumviri* had condemned mechanically with no such approval, 'iniussu vestro.' I am not sure that another explanation might not serve, though I prefer the foregoing. After the law had been cancelled Cicero might speak as if there had never been proper legal authorisation, and 'iniussu vestro' might be 'by a law which was no law.'

I assume therefore that everything accomplished by the law of Labienus was undone; the procedure was illegal and the sentence invalid. Rabirius had no doubt appealed, as Suetonius and Dio knew, but the appeal would lapse like everything else, and the trial before the comitia centuriata described by Dio was not on an appeal from the *duumviri*. For the moment indeed Cicero and the senate had caused the defeat of Caesar's whole elaborate plan. How it would have ended otherwise, it is perhaps idle to speculate, but it is difficult to believe that the barbarous spectacle on the *Campus* would ever have been witnessed.

But at any rate this was not destined to be the conclusion of the incident. It is perfectly clear from what Cicero says about certain imputations made by Labienus against Rabirius, several of which were contained "in eadem multae inrogatione" (3, 8), that Rabirius was, or had been, on his trial on charges for which a fine, probably a heavy one, was the threatened penalty. The phrase 'multae inrogatio' was far too technical to be used in any but its strict and literal sense. Such charges, like capital charges, would be heard three times by the prosecuting tribune before a *contio*, and after the third hearing, if he condemned—multam inrogavit—and if the fine exceeded a certain amount, appeal was allowed to the comitia tributa Probably at the commencement of the affair, and while the 'perduellionis iudicium' was being contrived, Labienus summoned Rabirius to appear before him in the forum on a specified day—diem dixit. The tribune may have owed Rabirius a grudge on account of the death of his uncle, who had perished with Saturninus. But his accusation on these minor charges was as likely as not part of Caesar's plan, since they might

increase the accused's unpopularity, and so render more certain his final condemnation on the capital charge. It is impossible from Cicero's vague statements to specify the counts comprised under this 'multae inrogatio.' I doubt if they were as numerous as is sometimes contended. Cicero is complaining that the half hour allowed him by Labienus is too long for an advocate to answer the minor charges, but too short for a consul to deal with the main point. He then mentions as unworthy of any answer a number of imputations on Rabirius which Labienus had clearly made in the course of his accusation (2, 7 to 3, 9). But most of these were merely old charges, raked up to create a prejudice against the accused, not counts in the present indictment. On one charge Rabirius had actually been tried and acquitted; on another a relative of Rabirius had been acquitted, and Rabirius himself not accused at all. Nor could the murder of his nephew have possibly been part of a mere fine-process. Cicero is not interested in repelling any of these charges, because, as we shall see, they had practically dropped out of the case before he made his speech. As for the charge "de civibus Romanis contra legem Porciam verberatis aut necatis," it could not possibly, as a capital offence, have been visited by a fine, and was probably mere rumour, brought up by Labienus to reinforce his capital charge. As far as I can see, only two counts in the 'multae inrogatio' remain: a violation of the lex Fabia de plagiariis, and a charge of scandalous immorality. That the latter was the foremost count may be inferred from the words "quod est in eadem multae inrogatione praescriptum." (I follow Prof. A. C. Clark in reading *praescriptum* rather than *perscriptum*.)

But it was open to a tribune in the course of his three hearings in the forum to convert, if he thought the evidence required it, what had begun as a fine-process into a capital impeachment. Among the earlier cases the one most in point is that of Fulvius, in which, according to Livy, "cum tribunus bis pecuniae anquisisset, tertio capitis anquirere diceret." (Liv. xxvi, 3.) If we assume that this is what took place in the present case, it seems to me that we can assign a consistent and intelligible place to the 'multae inrogatio' within the

whole process, and that it thus becomes possible to regard the proceeding, when once the interlude of the duumviral farce was excised by senatorial decree as invalid, as in complete accord with established precedent.

Labienus therefore had either already issued the summons for, or had actually begun an accusation against, Rabirius in the form of a fine-process in the forum at the time when by the action of Cicero and the senate the 'perduellionis iudicium' on the model of the Horatian archetype was quashed out of existence. The defeat was mortifying, but it was not fatal, for Labienus at once received instructions to convert his prosecution into a normal tribunician impeachment for *perduellio*, and on these new lines the case proceeded, as with better counsels it might have begun. Whether the change was made at the first or second or even at the third 'anquisitio' there is nothing to show, but I imagine that it may have been marked by the introduction into the tribune's *contio* of the portrait of Saturninus, a fact alluded to by Cicero in the words: "nunquam profecto istam imaginem.....in rostra atque in contionem attulisses[1]." There was nothing of course which could be constitutionally objected to in the course that was now being taken, for the capital penalty was not being illegally added to the pecuniary, but substituted for it. It might well however be described as a hardship and calamity for Rabirius after all these years to go through the ignominy of trials in the forum —publica iudicia—, and to be threatened first with financial ruin and then with a capital sentence. That is how I interpret the following passage: "misera est ignominia iudiciorum publicorum, misera multatio bonorum, miserum exilium; sed tamen in omni calamitate retinetur aliquod vestigium libertatis" (4, 16). Even if the sentence must be a death sentence, at least there will be now no *crux* and no *carnifex*.

There are two inferences which in my opinion it is impos-

[1] 9, 25. Where the crux and carnifex are spoken of as present in the contio, I understand the expression figuratively, and refer it to the contio in which the law to set up the duumviral court was promulgated. But it is clear that the portrait was actually produced before the people, and I have no doubt that it was during the trial. Cicero's references are all so vague that it is difficult to nail them down.

sible not to draw from Cicero's speech. The first has been already sufficiently enunciated, viz. that all danger of execution on the cross was a thing of the past. The second inference is not less clear, that at the time when the speech was delivered Rabirius was still the defendant in a capital trial, still theoretically, if not practically, in danger of his life. I do not press the title of the speech, *Pro Rabirio perduellionis reo*, for that may have been affixed later, but there is internal evidence which cannot be got over. At the very outset Cicero thinks it necessary to explain his own position, "in hac defensione capitis, famae, fortunarumque omnium C. Rabiri" (1, 1). Again, it is 'vita C. Rabiri' as well as 'salus reipublicae' which is at stake (2, 5). After showing how many good men now dead had obeyed the call of the consul in 100, "quot ex his qui vivunt" he asks "eodem crimine in summum periculum capitis arcessas?" (9, 26). Similarly, all loyal citizens "abs te capitis C. Rabiri nomine citantur" (11, 31). These passages, of which the implication is unmistakable, are by no means weakened in the peroration, which has been strangely adduced by some scholars as an argument against the capital nature of the case. "Neque a vobis iam bene vivendi sed honeste moriendi facultatem petit, neque tam ut domo sua fruatur, quam ne patrio sepulcro privetur laborat.....Nihil aliud iam vos orat atque obsecrat nisi uti...eum.....in patria mori patiamini" (13, 37). But this is the 'miserum exilium' of 5, 16 over again, and that *exilium*, which Cicero declares was never by Roman law a punishment, but always 'supplicii perfugium,' would be the result of a capital sentence. There were circumstances of course in which a heavy fine might drive a man into exile, but this was not the punishment of which exile was the recognised 'perfugium,' and taken with the passages previously cited, Cicero's concluding words help to establish the point that Rabirius was 'perduellionis reus' when Cicero's speech was delivered.

The case therefore in the later stages of the trial in the forum before Labienus resolved itself into an impeachment of Rabirius for the political murder of Saturninus. We must assume that witnesses were produced on both sides as to the

question of fact, for, though Cicero himself makes little of it, it appears that Hortensius, who probably defended Rabirius in the forum, had 'multorum testimonio' disproved the fact of the murder by the accused (6, 18). There may have been and probably was counter evidence, and, as already pointed out, the reward given to a slave for the deed was not conclusive. It was indeed this conflict of evidence about the facts which had made the duumviral trial with its 'indicta causa' and compulsory condemnation such a scandalous violation of legal forms. In the case of Horatius the facts had been undisputed, and Caesar had either overlooked this essential point of difference, or had chosen to regard the murder as a matter of common knowledge. But it is obvious enough that the prosecution no more than the defence restricted itself to the strictly legal issues. Labienus was playing the part of 'tribunus popularis,' and talked vaguely of liberty and the Porcian law. He even seems to have compared his own action to that of C. Gracchus in calling Popilius to account. We may be thankful to him for this, since it was in pointing the contrast between the true and false 'popularis' that Cicero tells us all we know of the *lex Sempronia de capite civium.*

At the conclusion of the third hearing Rabirius must have been condemned by Labienus, and would of course appeal, or be understood to appeal, to a *iudicium populi* in the form of the comitia centuriata. Both Suetonius and Dio know of the *provocatio*, but they both represent it as an appeal from the duumviral sentence, and Dio goes straight from the appeal to the final incident in the Campus Martius. We should not look for all the steps of this complicated case from either author, and I cannot regard the considerable gap left in the story by Dio as a serious objection to my theory of the case. The decision therefore came in the end before the comitia centuriata in the Campus Martius, but on appeal not from the duumviral sentence, but from that of Labienus. Rabirius might of course have saved himself, as so many had done before him, by voluntary exile, but Cicero no doubt had good hopes of a favourable result, and persuaded him to stand his ground. When the day came, Cicero delivered the speech which we

possess. That it was delivered at the final stage and on the day when the votes of the people were to decide the fate of Rabirius, is an irresistible inference from the internal evidence of the speech itself. At the very outset and in the same sentence in which he emphasises the capital nature of the charge, he calls upon his hearers 'ad absolvendum,' a meaningless appeal unless a vote was to be given (1, 1). Soon after he declares that a greater or more critical matter has never been 'ad populum Romanum delatam' (2, 4), an unmistakable reference to a 'iudicium populi.' Before long, he prays the immortal gods "ut hodiernum diem et ad huius salutem conservandam et ad rempublicam constituendam inluxisse patiantur" (2, 5), where the day on which he was speaking is beyond a doubt the final day of the whole proceedings. If more proof is needed, we get it in two decisive passages, both implying that it was by their actual votes, and by no less direct means, that the people were to save both Rabirius and the state: "vita C. Rabiri.....salus reipublicae vestris manibus suffragiisque permittitur" (2, 5): and "non vos ad arma vocandos esse verum ad suffragia cohortandos.....putavi" (12, 35). Yet another passage, as I interpret it, refers to the country voters, who rightly or wrongly were believed by Cicero to have come in to vote for Rabirius. What need to answer charges of cruelty in Apulia or Campania "cum ad eius propulsandum periculum non modo homines sed prope regiones ipsae convenerint?" (2, 8). These passages are of course in themselves compatible with the view that the *iudicium populi* before which Cicero was assuredly speaking was the comitia tributa assembled to give its final decision on the *multae inrogatio* of Labienus. But apart from the overwhelming difficulty of finding a place for this supposed secondary *iudicium populi* either before or after the meeting of the centuries attested by Dio, the indications, already dealt with, that Cicero was speaking on a capital charge, are too strong to admit of this hypothesis. Nor is it conceivable that Cicero would have delivered his decisive speech on what, if we separate the *multae inrogatio* from the charge of *perduellio*, was a minor and subsidiary issue. I know of only one passage which can be

interpreted so as to suggest that the proceedings against Rabirius had not reached their final stage. It is where Cicero concludes a vehement attack on the outrageous character of the duumviral court with the words "liberum tempus nobis dabitur ad istam disceptationem" (5, 17). What does he mean by 'istam disceptationem'? Only a few sentences before had come the passage, already quoted, in which Cicero declares that by his means Labienus had been driven "ex illa crudeli, importuna, non tribunicia actione sed regia." He proceeds: "Qua tu in actione quamquam omnia exempla maiorum, omnes leges, omnem auctoritatem senatus, omnes religiones atque auspiciorum publica iura neglexisti, tamen a me haec in hoc tam exiguo meo tempore non audies: liberum tempus nobis dabitur ad istam disceptationem." Cicero therefore is alluding here solely to the 'iudicium perduellionis sublatum,' to proceedings, which, however illegal and unconstitutional, were things of the past and cancelled: "so I shall not waste any of my miserably short half-hour by dwelling on them further. I shall have the opportunity as consul of bringing these matters forward later on." I cannot doubt that this interpretation of the passage will be accepted. There may be a temptation to translate 'non audies' 'you refuse to hear,' but it certainly means 'I shall not speak of.' Any steps which Cicero intended to take later in the year to call Labienus to account for his action were of course prevented by the more exciting events which followed.

Cicero's speech then was delivered before the comitia centuriata, in which the Roman people was hearing the appeal of Rabirius from the capital sentence not of the *duumviri* but of Labienus. With this supposition the internal evidence entirely accords. Whatever magistrate condemned Rabirius would have had, as we know from several cases in Livy, to have asked the praetor for a day, i.e. for leave to summon the centuries at the expiration of a *trinundinum*, and to preside at the meeting. He would there play the double part of president and 'accusator.' There would be a 'certatio' between him and the accused man or his advocate, just as there had been between Horatius and the *duumvir* who had pronounced sentence. It has always

been an objection, and it seems to me a fatal though not the most fatal one, against Dio's representation of the *iudicium populi* as an appeal from the duumviral sentence, that Labienus, and not either C. or L. Caesar, was obviously presiding when Cicero made his speech. It is to Labienus that Cicero addresses himself again and again; it is Labienus who is 'accusator' (2, 6); and it is Labienus who decides how long Cicero is allowed to speak. It has been partly to escape this difficulty that the untenable suggestion has been made that the speech belongs to some stage of the 'multae inrogatio.' On the other hand it is no small support to my presentation of the whole case that in what is obviously a capital trial before the Quirites present to give their votes, it is beyond question Labienus who is presiding.

As to the termination of the *iudicium populi*, we are dependent on the account given by Dio Cassius. From this it appears that the proceedings were brought to an abrupt end through the lowering of the red flag, which by immemorial usage had to be kept hoisted on the Ianiculum while the Roman people met as the assembled army in the Campus Martius below. Dio explains in some detail the origin and meaning of this custom, but we are not here concerned with it. What we should be concerned with, if there were any way of answering the question, would be the motive which induced the praetor, Metellus Celer, to have recourse to this primitive piece of machinery. What Dio tells us is that after the appeal *πάντως ἂν καὶ παρὰ τῷ δήμῳ ἑάλω, εἰ μὴ ὁ Μέτελλος ὁ Κέλερ, οἰωνιστής τε ὢν καὶ στρατηγῶν, ἐνεπόδισεν* (xxxvii, 27). He adds, after explaining the means adopted, *οὕτω μὲν δὴ τότε ἥ τε ἐκκλησία, καθαιρεθέντος τοῦ σημείου, διελύθη καὶ ὁ Ῥαβίριος ἐσώθη. ἐξῆν μὲν γὰρ τῷ Λαβιήνῳ καὶ αὖθις δικάσασθαι, οὐ μέντοι ἐποίησεν αὐτό* (cap. 28). The last statement, if accepted, disposes of the view, also rendered untenable by internal evidence, that the 'multae inrogatio' was a second attack upon Rabirius made after the capital charge had collapsed. That this in itself would have been a possible course is not only implied by the words of Dio, but is illustrated by the case of Claudius Pulcher, who, when his condemnation by the centuries

on a charge of *perduellio* was prevented by a storm, was heavily fined in a process before the comitia tributa (Val. Max. VIII. 1, abs. 4, Cic. de Nat. Deor. II. 7, div. II. 71). According to Dio, Rabirius would certainly have been condemned but for the intervention of Metellus. On the whole I see no reason to reject this. Dio certainly does not give a clear or complete account of the affair, but he must have been following in a confused way a version more detailed than his own. He knew of the two struggles, *περὶ τοῦ δικαστηρίου* and *περὶ τῆς κρίσεως*; he knew something of the duumviral court and of objections to it, as not *κατὰ τὰ πάτρια*; and if we accept his knowledge of the act of Metellus, it is somewhat arbitrary to reject the reason assigned for it. It is sometimes held that the words of Suetonius favour the belief that the people would have acquitted Rabirius; "ut ad populum provocanti nihil aeque ac iudicis acerbitas profuerit." I think this means no more than that after the summary and barbarous sentence of the *duumviri*, some indignation and sympathy was evoked by these 'inusitata supplicia,' manifestations, which perhaps encouraged Cicero in the step already described. What Cicero's speech for the defence was like we know, and how full of arguments not strictly relevant to the point at issue. The speeches for the prosecution we have not got, but apart from the initial error of judgment in reviving obsolete barbarities, Caesar's case would not be an ineffective one, and very likely Labienus made the best of it. We need not decide whether Cicero was privy to the contrivance by which, if things looked bad, his eloquence was to be supplemented, but there was something perhaps of retributive justice in the concluding incident. Caesar, who had opened the attack by the revival of obsolete judicial machinery, found himself checkmated by a less barbarous but more ridiculous revival of the same sort.

E. G. HARDY.

JUVENAL AND TWO OF HIS EDITORS.

The following remarks are occasioned by Mr S. G. Owen's paper on 'The Phillipps manuscripts of Juvenal' in the last number of this Journal, pp. 238–64, and more especially by the six paragraphs in which my name occurs. The particular questions at issue are mostly trifles and mostly incapable of decision; but their discussion will have a more general interest as showing how differently it is possible for two scholars to conduct their mental operations. The causes which render me unintelligible to Mr Owen and Mr Owen unintelligible to me are probably many and various, but perhaps it is not difficult to distinguish and isolate one. I am accustomed to reach conclusions by reasoning and to commend them by argument. How Mr Owen reaches conclusions I have no means of knowing except by observing how he commends them; and I observe that argument is not his favourite method. His favourite method is simple affirmation, which he applies to the settlement of disputed questions with the utmost freedom and confidence. For this confidence I see so little ground that I infer it has some ground which I cannot see; and the less evidence of reason I find in Mr Owen's writing the more am I forced to the hypothesis that he has access to a higher and purer source of illumination.

III 236 sq. (p. 246).

raedarum transitus arto
uicorum inflexu.

'The reading *in flexu* was adopted by Housman from the editiones ueteres. But though it is true that the substantive *flexus* is common, while *inflexus* is rare (it is quoted, besides

this passage, only from Sen. Breu. Vit. 12 4 and Arnob. 2 p. 57 by Forcellini), this is clearly one of the cases in which the vocabulary of later Latin appears first or nearly first in Juvenal. The word is doubtless colloquial.'

'Clearly,' for revelation makes all clear. 'Doubtless,' for revelation dispels all doubt. But if one is a simple *ζῷον λογιστικόν*, not entitled to use adverbs in lieu of argument, one cannot talk in that style. Whether Juvenal meant INFLEXV for one word or for two, *inflexu* or *in flexu*, is a question which only Mr Owen and the Pope are competent to decide: all that I can do is to balance probabilities. The way I went to work was this: it is certain, I said to myself, that the substantive *flexus* existed in Juvenal's time, and it is not certain that *inflexus* did. For I was not content to take my text of Seneca from Forcellini; I went to dial. x 12 4 itself, and I found that the best MS and the last edition had not *inflexu* but *in flexus*. I further observed what seemed to be some support for *flexu* in a similar passage of Tacitus, ann. xv 38 4 'obnoxia urbe *artis* itineribus hucque et illuc *flexis* atque enormibus *uicis*.' But when Mr Owen says 'In *inflexu* I recognise the signature of Juvenal' I can make no counter-proclamation that I recognise Juvenal's signature in *in flexu*: the rushlight of reason sheds much too faint a ray.

VII 184 sq. (p. 247).

ueniet qui fercula docte
conponat, ueniet qui pulmentaria condit.

conponat P and most MSS, *conponit* GT.
condit P and most MSS, *condat* LOU.

'In order to regularise the moods Leo follows Housman in retaining *condit* and accepting *componit* from G. "artifices dicit, inde indicatiui" says Leo. But we have here an instance of variation of construction, the consecutive subjunctive *componat* being followed by a relative indicative clause.'

If this piece of dialectic occurred in the writings of an uninspired author it would be called by the harsh name of petitio principii; for the very question at issue is whether we have or have not a variation of construction here. But we

have, for Mr Owen has said so. We have another, by the by, in Pers. III 60, 'est aliquid quo *tendis* et in quod *dirigăs* arcum'; at least, one would have thought so, for this also is the reading of P; but I see that Mr Owen prints *derigis*, so it appears that not even P can be trusted in this matter, but only Mr Owen.

I 168 (p. 248).

inde irae et lacrimae.

'Here for *irae* GO *Val.* and a few other MSS have *ira*, a reading which is adopted by no editor except Housman, who defends it because "the singular *ira*, not the plural *irae*, is the just and proper counterpart to the plural *lacrimae*, which is of another nature." This justification fails because it does not take account of Latin usage.'

Mr Owen then proceeds to teach me Latin usage, a thing I am always anxious to learn. He says that 'the Latin plural very early underwent a weakening, so that it ceased to differ from the singular in meaning,' and that 'as time went on this weakening tendency increased,' and that 'with the word *ira* this is conspicuously the case: singular and plural are used indifferently with identical sense.' Exactly so; and therefore, as I said, the plural *irae* is not a just and proper counterpart to the plural *lacrimae*, which is of another nature.

But assume that my objection to *irae* fails: now let us hear Mr Owen's objection to *ira*. 'It is clear that not *ira* but *irae* is the correct reading.' It is clear to him, and that must suffice. It is also clear, he says, that *irae* is 'the reading which Cyprian had before him, as appears from his imitation Heptat. Genes. 895 *inde irae et lacrimae*.' What Cyprian had before him, and what he wrote, has been disclosed to nobody but Mr Owen: the three MSS differ, none of them gives what Mr Owen gives, and the only one whose reading is metrical has *inde ira et lacrimae*.

XIII 49 sq. (p. 251).

nondum aliquis sortitus triste profundi
imperium aut Sicula toruos cum coniuge Pluton.

49 *aliquis* om. P. 50 *aut* om. LO.

On the ground that *triste* is applicable to Pluto's empire and inapplicable to Neptune's I proposed

nondum <imi> sortitus triste profundi
imperium Sicula toruos cum coniuge Pluton.

See Luc. VI 341 'imi...habitator Olympi,' Stat. Theb. IV 476 'imi...regia mundi,' Sil. V 241 'deus ima colentum,' VII 688 sq. 'aeternae regnator noctis, ad imos | cum fugeret thalamos.' Leo, following me, preferred '<atri>,' which perhaps is no less probable. But Mr Owen says that 'there are two insuperable objections to the conjecture'; and they are these. '(1) it leaves Neptune unmentioned in this full catalogue of the gods.' This full catalogue of the gods already omits Apollo, Diana, Mercury, Mars, Venus, Vesta, Ceres, and Minerva, not to mention Amphitrite; but if it also omitted Neptune it would cease to be a full catalogue; and this is an insuperable objection. Mr Owen and I do not even speak the same language: he uses the word 'full' to express the idea which I express by the word 'defective.' Pass to the second insuperable objection: '(2) it assigns to *profundum* the meaning of "hell," a meaning which as far as I know is unparalleled.' It assigns to *profundum* its proper meaning, 'the deep'; and *imum profundum* is what Milton calls 'the lowest deep.' There are half a dozen verses in the Aetna alone where *profundum* signifies the subterranean world; for example 578 'septemque duces raptumque profundo' (Amphiaraum). So 'insuperable' is another of the English words to which Mr Owen and I attach different notions. But even after surmounting two insuperable objections I cannot escape defeat, for Mr Owen now brings up his 42 centimetre gun: '*aliquis* is unquestionably right.' Nil ultra quaero plebeius.

I 150 sq. (p. 254).

dices hic forsitan 'unde
ingenium par materiae?'

dices PBO, *dicas* most MSS.

'I see no reason why *dicas* should be preferred to *dices*, as it is by Mr Housman followed by Leo.'—When Mr Owen says

'followed by Leo' he appears to mean 'preceded by Jahn, Hermann, Friedlaender, and Buecheler.'—'Two reasons are given for preferring it: "(1) because *forsitan* in Juvenal regularly takes the subjunctive, and (2) because, apart from *forsitan*, the subjunctive is usual when no definite person is addressed" (Housman, pref. p. xix).'

'As to (1)' begins Mr Owen, and then, instead of invalidating my reason, he substantiates it. He obligingly cites the facts upon which my statement was founded, and shows that Juvenal elsewhere has four examples of *forsitan* with the subjunctive and only one with the indicative. The subjunctive therefore, as I said, is the rule, and the indicative the exception.

'As to (2), the passages where the subjunctive undoubtedly occurs are v 156 *forsitan...credas*, viii 113 *forsitan...despicias*, xi 162 *forsitan expectes*, xiv 34 *forsitan...spernant*, and with *forsan* vi 14 *forsan...extiterint*. Of these v 156, viii 113, xi 162 are not cases of subjunctive "where no definite person is addressed."' Very true; they are cases of subjunctive due to *forsitan*, which, as I said, regularly takes the subjunctive. But why is Mr Owen making this remark 'as to (2),' i.e. as to my argument that 'apart from *forsitan*, the subjunctive is usual when no definite person is addressed'? What sense, if any, does he attach to the word 'apart'? 'Moreover,' says he, 'the statement that "the subjunctive is usual when no definite person is addressed" is in direct conflict with the conclusion at which Dr Roby arrives in his exhaustive essay on this particular point (Latin Grammar ii, preface, pp. ci–cvii), where after a long collection of instances Dr Roby decides that "the indicative is the ordinary use" (p. ciii).' If so, Dr Roby is wrong. But Mr Owen does not know what Dr Roby's exhaustive essay is about, and apparently has not even perused its title, which is 'Of the expressions *dicat aliquis, dixerit aliquis*.' To the use of verbs in the second person it contains only one allusion, which I will transcribe; and I wish Mr Owen joy of it: p. ciii 'the indicative...is exceedingly frequent in the second person, *when a definite person is meant*.'

I repeat then that when the person addressed is not a definite person the subjunctive and not the indicative is usual.

I did not say that it was invariable, nor is it. The indicative, though very rare, does sometimes occur; and Mr Owen will be more than ever assured that *dices* is right when I refer him to Catull. 89 6 'quantumuis quare sit macer *inuenies*.'

I 155 sq. (p. 255).

> pone Tigellinum, taeda lucebis in illa
> qua stantes ardent qui fixo pectore fumant.

pectore PBAO, *gutture* most MSS.

'The reading *gutture* is absurd. It is defended by Mr Housman on the ground that to fasten a victim by the throat would involve less trouble.' It was defended by me on four grounds; but this is the only one of them which Mr Owen can remember. 'As if the object of torturers was to save themselves trouble! Such people are prepared to take infinite trouble.' If necessary, I had better quote what I actually said: '*gutture*...is on every count superior: superior palaeographically, as the less common word, and superior in sense, because to fasten a victim by the throat involves less trouble, consumes less material, *and causes more discomfort*, than to fasten him by the chest.' Mr Owen however dissents: 'And consider what the result of fastening the victim by the throat would be. The swift result would be throttling and consequent death, the last thing desired by the torturer, whose object is to prolong the pain.' If the torturer were so misguided as to use a slipknot, throttling, I imagine, would indeed be the result: but not otherwise: we do not hear that throttling was of frequent occurrence in the pillory. *fixo* moreover, properly 'nailed,' implies nothing so loose as a slipknot, and will indicate rather a collar clamped to the stake. But the torturer's object, says Mr Owen, 'would be better attained by fastening by the chest: then the victim while being roasted could not struggle, so far from stopping his anguish by throttling himself he could not even show it.' I cannot struggle either: I feel like the queen of Sheba when she had seen all Solomon's wisdom and there was no more spirit in her. Is there in all the wide world a single person except Mr Owen who conceives that to fasten

a man by the chest will prevent him from moving his arms and legs? Does Mr Owen himself conceive it? Does his mind know that this is the meaning of the words which his hand has written?

His final stroke is now impending. 'So the scholiast understood it: "ut lucerent spectatoribus, cum fixa essent illis guttura, ne se curuarent."' The dispute is whether Juvenal wrote *fixo pectore* or *fixo gutture*; and when the scholiast says 'cum *fixa* essent illis *guttura, ne se curuarent*,' Mr Owen quotes those words as showing how the scholiast understood *fixo pectore*. Am I awake or asleep?

A. E. HOUSMAN.

A COLLATION OF THE HISTORY OF SOCRATES' SCHOLASTICUS, BOOKS IV—VII, WITH THE OLD ARMENIAN VERSION AND WITH THE LATIN VERSION OF EPIPHANIUS SCHOLASTICUS AS PRESERVED IN THE HISTORIA TRIPARTITA OF CASSIODORIUS.

Book IV.

1 § 1 *ἐν τῇ αὐτοῦ ὑπατείᾳ.* Arm. involves *αὐτῇ* as conjectured by Valesius.

1 § 7 *τὰς ζώνας...μᾶλλον ἀφιέναι ἠροῦντο ἢ ἀφιέναι τὸν Χριστιανισμόν.* Valesius notes: malim scribere *ἢ ἀφεῖναι.* Arm. renders the two verbs "to let go" and "to deny," which favours Valesius' conjecture.

1 § 14 *οἱ ἐν Σελευκείᾳ διακριθέντες τοῖς περὶ Ἀκάκιον.* Here *διακριθέντες* is a conjecture of Valesius. Arm. substantiates it; earlier editors read *διδαχθέντες* or *διενεχθέντες.*

3 § 4 *ὡς ἐν ξηρᾷ εὑρεθῆναι.* Arm. adds *τοὺς πλέοντας,* probably a mere gloss.

4 § 5 *Μακεδονίου δόγμα, μικρόν τε ἔμπροσθεν καὶ τὸ ἐν τῇ κατὰ Λάμψακον συνόδῳ γενόμενον φανερώτερον.*

Valesius' conjecture *μικρὸν τὸ ἔμπροσθεν καὶ τότε ἐν κτλ.* is borne out by Arm.

5 § 2 *μετ' οὐ πολὺ δὲ ζωγρήσας εἶχε τὸν Προκόπιον.* Valesius conjectured from the Latin Version *εἶλε* for *εἶχε,* and Arm. confirms the conjecture.

5 § 3 *τοὺς μὲν προδότας ὑπεριδών.* Both Arm. and Latin add *γάρ* after *μέν* as conjectured by Valesius.

[1] As reprinted from the Texts of Valesius and Reading at the Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1844.

5 § 3 *τοῦ δὲ τυράννου δύο δένδρων καμφθέντων γειτνιαζόντων ἀλλήλοις ἑκάτερον σκέλος ἐκδήσας ἐπικαμφθέντων ἀφῆκεν ὀρθοῦσθαι.* Corruptus est hic locus ut satis apparet, observes Valesius. Arm. omits both *καμφθέντων* and *ἐπικαμφθέντων*; the Latin only the latter. Neither is requisite to the sense, but one must certainly be left out, preferably the second. Nicephorus has *κατακαμφθεῖσι* alone, answering to *καμφθέντων*, for which we perhaps should read *κατακαμφθέντων*.

7 § 5 *εἰς βλασφημίαν ἐξέπεσε.* Both versions involve *βλασφημίας*, conjectured by Valesius.

7 § 8 *τὸν Εὐνόμιον Εὐδόξιος πρὸς τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν τῆς Κυζίκου προὐβάλλετο.*

Both versions add "expellere nisus Eleusium."

8 § 1 *καὶ τὰς πύλας τῆς πόλεως προϊόντος ἀπέκλεισαν.* Valesius conjectured *παριόντος*, which Arm. confirms.

8 § 6 *Κωνσταντινουπόλει.* Arm. *τῇ πόλει* which Nicephorus has in this context.

8 § 8 *ὑδρεῖον μέγιστον...ὃ ἐφημίσθη δαψιλὲς ὕδωρ.* Latin has nymphaeum maximum...ubi aquae affluentia est emissa, and Arm. has the same general sense, but corresponds exactly to *ᾧ ἐφυδρεύθη δαψιλὲς ὕδωρ.* We cannot suppose that *δαψιλὲς ὕδωρ* was a name given to a public fountain. Perhaps *ᾧ ἐφειλκύσθη* is the true reading. However Nicephorus had *ἐφημίσθη*, for he paraphrases *ὠνόμασται.*

8 § 10 *τότε δὲ λυομένου.* Arm. and Latin add *τοῦ τείχους.*

11 § 1 *τῇ δευτέρᾳ τοῦ Ἰουλίου μηνός.* Latin and Arm. have *Ἰουνίου* "of June."

11 § 2 *τὴν δὲ χάλαζαν πολλοὶ ἔφασκον κατὰ μῆνιν θεοῦ κατενηνέχθαι.* Arm. has *βασιλέως* for *θεοῦ*, perhaps also Latin: quod multi dicebant propter motum imperatoris accidere. If the substitution be correct, then the words *ὁ βασιλεύς* are superfluous in the next clause and Arm. omits them, as also Latin. From Nicephorus' paraphrase *κατὰ θεομηνίαν ἔφασκον γενέσθαι βασιλεῖ* we may conjecture that Socrates wrote *κατὰ μῆνιν θεοῦ κατενηνέχθαι.*

12 § 1 *οἱ δὲ φόβῳ μᾶλλον καὶ βίᾳ στενοχωρούμενοι.* Arm. has *ἤ* for *καί*, but Latin reads violentiaque: *ἤ* is surely correct.

12 § 4 *τὴν παλαιὰν Ῥώμην κατέλαβον.* Latin : ad Italiam pervenerunt, which is also implied in Arm. Therefore read *τὴν Ἰταλίαν κατέλαβον.* The Latin version of Nicephorus which alone remains here has: in Italiam pervenere.

12 § 6 *μηδέν τε διαφέρειν τοῦ ὁμοουσίου τὸ ὅμοιον.*

Valesius corrects *τε* to *δέ*; the Latin has nihilque differre a consubstantiali per omnia similem, so we should read *τὸ κατὰ πάντα ὅμοιον*, which Nicephorus (XI 6) here reads. Perhaps an echo of the addition survives in the gloss added by Arm.: "but that they were *in all ways* at one with the council of the orthodox believers, of the holy 318 Fathers of Nice."

12 § 10. *ἕως νῦν καὶ διηνεκῶς διαμένει.* The permanebit of Latin implies *διαμενεῖ* which is better, and is reflected in the Latin version of Nicephorus: in perpetuum duratura est.

12 § 22 Read *ἥτις μέχρι νῦν ἀπὸ τῆς κατὰ Νίκαιαν.*

14 § 2 *δεκαεννέα ἐνιαυτούς.* Arm. and Latin involve *δεκαένα*, which, as Valesius saw, chronology requires. Just before instead of *Οὐάλεντος τὸ τρίτον*, Arm. reads *Οὐάλ. τὸ δεύτερον.*

16 § 1 *Οὐρβανὸς.* Arm., Latin and Nicephorus have *Οὔρβασος.*

17 § 2 *τέλεον γὰρ ἐξελάσας τοὺς τὸ ὁμοούσιον φρονοῦντας τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν σχεδὸν τῶν ἀνατολικῶν πόλεων οὐκ ἠρκεῖτο τούτῳ.*

Arm. has *τῶν ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ σχεδόν κτλ.* The *καὶ* is requisite to the sense.

18 § 2 *ὁ βασιλεὺς Οὐάλης.* Arm. and Latin omit *Οὐάλης.*

18 § 2 *μαθὼν πᾶν τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀπεχθεῖς αἱρέσεως εἶναι τῶν συνερχομένων τὸ πλῆθος.*

* Latin has: cognoscens sibi omnes exosos ibidem convenire. Arm. involves *πάντας τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀπεχθείᾳ αἱρέσεως κτλ. πάντας* is needed if *ἀπεχθεῖς* is kept; it stands in apposition

to τὸ πλῆθος. The Armenian reading ἀπεχθείᾳ yields the same sense. The vulgar reading is impossible.

19 § 4 after ὧν ζῆλον ἔχειν ἐνόμιζεν Arm. adds "he followed demons rather, and" which may be a gloss.

19 § 5 καὶ Θεοδόσιοι. Both Arm. and Latin omit.

20 § 1 after καὶ τὴν Αἴγυπτον Arm. and Latin omit ὁ βασιλεύς.

23 § 9 ἐν τοσούτῳ οἰκήματι. Valesius conjectured ἐν τῷ σῷ οἰκ. Arm. involves ἐν τῷ σεαυτοῦ οἰκ.

23 § 25 εἰπόντος, Ἀρίθμησον ὃ δέδωκα, ἔφη, Ἀριθμοῦ οὐ χρῄζειν, ἀλλ' ὑγιοῦς διαθέσεως. Arm. adds θεόν after Ἀριθμοῦ, perhaps rightly.

23 § 27 δύο μέν, ἔφη, ἐκίνησεν.

Arm. and Latin = duae inquit me res moverunt, so read με for μέν as Valesius conjectured.

23 § 28 Ἄλλος δέ τις ἔλεγεν ὅτι ὁ μοναχὸς εἰ μὴ ἐργάζοιτο.

Arm. here renders a Greek text which ran somewhat as follows:

Ἄλλος δέ τις ἔλεγεν περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ μακαρίου Παμβῶ, ὅτι πολλὰ ἔτη ηὔχετο λέγων· Κύριε μή με δόξασον ἐπὶ γῆς. ὡσαύτως δὲ τίμιον (?) καὶ ἐδόξασεν ὥσπερ τὸν Μωϋσέα, ὥσπερ γὰρ εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον ἐκείνου οὐκ ἐνῆν ἀτενίσαι διὰ τὴν δόξαν τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ, ἣν ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ ὁ θεός, οὕτως καὶ οὗτος τὴν αὐτὴν χάριν ἐδέξατο, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐδύνατο ἀτενίσαι εἰς αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις αὐτοῦ ἡμέραις.

ὁ δὲ ἀββᾶς Ἀρσένιος ἔλεγεν ὅτι ὁ μοναχὸς εἰ μὴ ἐργάζοιτο κτλ.

The entire section has dropt out by reason of a scribe's eye running on from one ἔλεγεν to the other. The lacuna already stood in the copy of Socrates used by Epiphanius Scholasticus.

23 § 31 δι' ἄσκησιν, διὰ βίον. Arm. adds διὰ τρόπον, so also Latin: *mores*.

23 § 32 πρὸς τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας αὐστηρός. circa delin-

quentes severus, is the Latin rendering as if of *ἁμαρτάνοντας* but Arm. had *ἐντυγχάνοντας*, for it renders "towards his readers."

23 § 36 *μοναχός, ἢ περὶ πρακτικῆς ἐπιγέγραπται.* Latin gives *μοναχικός* written in Greek characters. Arm. adds *κεφάλαια δὲ αὐτοῦ ἕκατον*, omitted both in Greek and in Latin texts, but undoubtedly genuine, since Socrates in the immediate sequel gives the number of chapters of the other work of Evagrius, the *Gnosticus*, in the same manner, viz.: *κεφάλαια δὲ αὐτοῦ πεντήκοντα.*

23 § 37 *τὸ δὲ, Ἀντιρρητικός.* Arm. has *τὸ δὲ τρίτον*, Ἀντ. which is surely right. A *γ'* might easily be lost in the original.

23 § 39 *ἅτινα ὅπως ἐστὶ θαυμαστά.* Arm. adds quamque utilia, probably a gloss of the translator.

23 § 44 *οὐδενὶ γὰρ οὕτως...ὡς ἐλέῳ τὰ τοιαῦτα κατασβέννυται πάθη.*

The case is that of a youth molested by night phantasms, whom the monk recommends "to tend the sick at the same time fasting." Arm. renders *ἐλέῳ γὰρ... ὡς ἐλαίῳ τὰ τοιαῦτα* κτλ., as if the monk gave as the reason underlying his advice this, that such wounds of the spirit are remedied by charity and mercy towards others as ordinary wounds by oil.

The pun must be intentional and could only arise in a Greek text. Nicephorus (XI 43) had the ordinary Greek text.

23 § 53 *τὸν λόγον πεπώληκα τὸν λέγοντα.* Arm. adds *ἐμοὶ ἀεί*, as also Latin: quod mihi semper dicit.

23 § 56 *εἰδοποιεῖσθαι.* The Armenian renders *εἰ δὴ ποιεῖσθαι*; an illustration of the pitfalls of which a continuously written Greek text was full for a careless translator.

Other examples in the same context are *ἀποτίθεσθαι* for *ἀπωθεῖσθαι* in § 63, *φθέγμα* for *φέγγος* in § 66, *μωρίᾳ* for *μόρια* and *ἐν τισίν* for *ἴστησιν* in § 69.

24 § 3 Εὐζώϊος δέ. Here δέ, as Valesius saw, is impossible. He suggests *μέν* instead of it: Arm. merely omits it.

24 § 4 *οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀπελείπετο, ἀλλὰ στῖφος ἁγίων ἀνθρώπων οὐδαμῶς οἰκτιζομένων χείρονα τῶν στρατιωτῶν διεπράττετο.*

Valesius renders the whole context as follows: statim ad Aegypti monasteria contendunt, Dux videlicet cum ingenti militum multitudine et Lucius Arianus. Nam et iste tunc adfuit, et sanctorum hominum coetum nulla miseratione prosecutus, gravius quam ipsi milites, adflixit.

The words *οὐδαμῶς οἰκτιζομένων* might no doubt be taken as predicate of *τῶν στρατιωτῶν*, "worse than soldiers who never pity," but they go more naturally with *ἁγίων ἀνθρώπων*, in which case they must be rendered "holy men in no way pitied." But *στῖφος* is an unusual word to use of a number of scattered anchorites. It clearly repeats the *σὺν πλήθει πολλῶν στρατιωτῶν* of the preceding clause. We must therefore adopt the Armenian reading *ἄγων* for *ἁγίων*. Lucius, though a Christian, *led* a force of pitiless men and treated his fellow Christians worse than any soldiers ever could. Epiphanius already read *ἁγίων* for *ἄγων*. The passage is a paraphrase of Rufinus *H. E.* II 3 (271), where we are told of Lucius: Tria millia simul, aut eo amplius, viros per totam eremum secreta et solitaria habitatione dispersos oppugnare pariter aggreditur. Mittit armatam equitum ac peditum manum: tribunos, praepositos, et bellorum duces, tanquam adversus barbaros pugnaturus elegit. In the Greek *στῖφος* answers to armatam manum, not to the dispersos.

24 § 7 *τοῖς ὅπλοις ἐκέχρηντο.* Here *ὄχλοις* is read in the Greek MSS, *ὅπλοις* being a conjecture of Valesius. Both Arm. and Latin confirm it. In the next §, no. 8, they equally confirm his conjecture *παρών* for *παρ' ὧν*.

24 § 9 *ὧν οὐκ ἦν ἄξιος ὁ κόσμος.* For *κόσμος* of the sacred text Arm. substitutes *Λούκιος*, perhaps rightly.

25 § 4 *ἐκ παιδὸς γὰρ ὢν εὐφυὴς καὶ ψυχῆς λαχὼν ἀγαθῆς ἐνίκα τοὺς εὐφυεῖς καὶ ὀξύτατα βλέποντας.* Valesius writes: vox *εὐφυεῖς* delenda est, quae ex superiore linea huc videtur irrepsisse. The text bears on Didymus who being blind, yet by force of memory and learning, excelled those who

retained their natural sight. Arm. reads *ἐνίκα τῇ εὐφυίᾳ τοὺς καὶ ὀξ. βλ.* which is certainly right.

25 § 5 *Γραμματικῆς τε γὰρ τοὺς κανόνας ῥᾳδίως κατώρθου καὶ Ῥητορικῆς πάλιν θᾶττον ἐλάμβανεν.*

Πάλιν is quite superfluous in the context. Latin abbreviates thus: Facile namque regulas grammaticae atque rhetoricae artis didicit. Rhetorical study was neither subsequent nor antithetic to grammatical; so we should adopt the Arm. reading *πάλην* for *πάλιν*.

25 § 10 *τοιοῦτοι γάρ σοι λείπουσιν ὀφθαλμοί, οἷς καὶ μυῖαι καὶ κώνωπες βλέψαι ἰσχύουσιν.* Latin: quibus et muscae et pulices nocere possunt. So also Arm. therefore correct to *βλάψαι*. The odd thing is that Rufinus from whom Socrates borrows the anecdote seems to have read *βλέψαι*: oculi illi quos mures et muscae et lacertae habent, and as Valesius notes, Jerome, *ad Castratium* (Ep 33), involves the same; but he probably took it from Rufinus. It is hardly possible that Socrates himself wrote *βλέψαι*.

26 § 12 *κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ τῷ βασιλείῳ διεπράττετο.* Valesius: Scribendum est procul dubio *καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ* κτλ. which is exactly what Arm. involves.

26 § 25 *τὴν πονηθεῖσαν Βασιλείῳ Ἑξαήμερον, ἅτε δὴ καταλειφθεῖσαν, προσανεπλήρωσε.*

The mere fact that Basil left this work behind him would not account for its completion by his brother Gregory; we must therefore add from the Armenian *ἀτελῆ* after *ἅτε δή*. It dropped out from its similarity to the same.

27 § 1 *Ἐπειδὴ δέ τινες ἐκ τῆς ὁμωνυμίας πλανῶνται, [καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐπιγραφομένων Γρηγορίου βιβλίων.] δεῖ εἰδέναι ὅτι ἄλλος ἐστιν ὁ Ποντικὸς Γρηγόριος.*

Arm. and Latin omit the words bracketed, but Nicephorus read them (XI 19).

27 § 2 *ἔν τε Ἀθήναις.* Arm. adds *ἔν τε Ἰλλυρίᾳ*, which is surely original, though Latin omits it.

27 § 2 *Ποντικῇ διοικήσει.* So Valesius corrects the MSS which have *οἰκήσει*; Nicephorus (XI 19) and Arm. confirm his conjecture.

27 § 4 Πάμφιλος ὁ μάρτυρ. Arm. adds καὶ Εὐσέβιος ὁ αὐτοῦ ἐπώνυμος. Latin also reads: et Pamphilus martyr et Eusebius.

27 § 4 ἐν οἷς καὶ συστατικὸς λόγος Γρηγορίου.

Valesius suggests συντακτικός which Arm. confirms, though Nicephorus read συστατικός.

28 § 1 ἐπικρατεῖ περὶ τὰ Φρυγῶν καὶ Παφλαγόνων ἔθνη ὁ ἀκριβὴς τῆς ἐκκλησίας αὐτῶν κάνων.

Here αὐτῶν is otiose, for it was not their private rule, but that of the great Church, that was in vogue with these races. Arm. and Latin both omit αὐτῶν.

28 § 3 πρὸς τὰ οἰκεῖα ἤθη. Arm. has πάθη for ἤθη. The admission of mortal sinners after their baptism to communion was a concession not to custom but to human frailty. The Latin also confirms πάθη: secundum proprios sensus.

28 § 4 ἐν τοσούτῳ δὲ τούτου κινουμένου τοῦ ζητήματος. Valesius conjectured ἐν τούτῳ δὲ τοσούτου. Latin has: Inter haec mota quaestione omitting τοσούτου. Arm. has τοσούτου δε κιν. τ. ζ., omitting ἐν τούτῳ.

28 § 5 ἕκαστος κατ' ἔθος. Arm. has ἔθνος which is wanted and is confirmed by Latin: singuli provincialium diversi sunt secuti sententias.

28 § 12 Ναυάτος μὲν οὖν. Arm. has Navatianus which is probably right, Socrates wishing to distinguish the institutions of the two.

28 § 13 οὕτως ἐπετέλεσε. Arm. αὐτός for οὕτως. Latin: etiam iste celebrabat. Valesius conjectures καὶ οὗτος which comes to the same thing. In the preceding clause κατὰ τὰ ἑσπέρια μέρη ἐποίει, as Valesius notes, we must either remove ἐποίει with the Latin or read καθώς with Nicephorus. Socrates probably wrote καθά.

28 § 15 οἱ δὲ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἐν Φρυγίᾳ ἐπώνυμοι κατὰ τὴν κοινωνίαν τούτου συνεχωρήθησαν ἐκτρεπόμενοι. Valesius notes: Hic locus mirum in modum corruptus est...iam temporibus Epiphanii scholastici corrupta erant exemplaria. He suggests τούτου συγχωρηθεῖσαν and renders permissam ipsis

communionem. Arm. restores the true reading which is *τούτους ὧν ἐχωρίσθησαν*, i.e. "they avoided in sacramental matters those from whom they had broken off," which is historically true.

28 § 17 *παρεῖναι τῇ γενομένῃ συνόδῳ.* After *τῇ* Arm. adds *τότε*, which is wanted.

31 § 11 *ἐκ τοῦ δεξιοῦ μέρους ἀλουργίδα βασιλικὴν ἀπεκύησε.* Arm. and Latin (ex dextro femore) read *μηροῦ* —an interesting survival of an old mythological idea.

31 § 21 *ἐκ πλακίδης.* Arm. and Latin have *ἐκ φλακίλλης*, with the ancient coins.

32 § 3 *ἕως αὐτοῦ.* Arm. adds *οὗ* after *ἕως.*

32 § 5 *πρὸς τὸ δόξαν ἐξ ἀνάγκης καὶ τὴν διαφωνίαν εἶναι πολλήν.* Arm. has *πρὸς τὴν πολυδοξίαν*, which may be right as Themistius whose *προσφωνητικὸς λόγος* is in question insisted on the multiplicity of philosophers' *δόγματα.*

33 § 1 *Ἀθαναρίχος.* Latin all through has Athalaricus.

33 § 8 *πρόσφατον θεὸν τὸν υἱόν.* So Armenian. Earlier texts omitted *θεόν.*

36 § 6 *ἐκεῖ τὴν ἱερωσύνην δεξάμενος.* Arm. *ὡς ἐκεῖ τ. ἱερ. δεξόμενος. Δεξόμενος* was conjectured by Valesius.

36 § 9 *ἐξελέγχουσιν ὡς Χριστιανικὰ ἔχεις δόγματα.* Arm. adds *οὐ* or *οὐχί* after *ὡς.* The point is that Lucius, who is addressed, was devoid of Christian scruples.

36 § 10 *Χριστιανὸς οὐ πλήσσει.* Arm. renders *οὐ βλασφημεῖ.*

38 § 1 *περὶ τὴν τριακάδα.* Arm. "on the first" which must be wrong.

38 § 5 *καὶ ὑπερβαίνει.* Latin egreditur, and so Arm. Valesius conjectured *ὑπεκβαίνει.*

Book V.

Prooemium § 1 *ὅσον τὴν ἱστορίαν.* Arm. *ὅσων,* sc. *πολέμων.*

§ 2 *τοῦτο γὰρ πολλῶν ἕνεκα ποιοῦμεν. Τοῦ εἰς γνῶσιν ἄγειν τὰ γινόμενα. Ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ τοῦ τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας μὴ προσκορεῖς γενέσθαι, ἐκ τοῦ μὴ σχολάζειν τῇ φιλονεικίᾳ τῶν ἐπισκόπων κτλ.*

Valesius suggested *ἀεί* for *μή* before *σχολάζειν,* "post haec enim verba sequi debet affirmatio." Arm. reconstitutes the whole passage thus: *...ποιοῦμεν, οὐ μόνον τοῦ εἰς γνῶσιν ἄ. τὰ γιν. ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ τοῦ τοὺς ἐντ. μὴ...ἐκ τοῦ μόνῃ σχολ. κτλ.* Here *οὐ μόνον* was easily dropped out after *ποιοῦμεν* and *μόνον* or *μόνῃ* is better than *ἀεί.*

§ 5 *ὥστε με τῶν διαδοχῶν τούτων μὴ ἔκ τινος συντυχίας δύνασθαι νομίζειν ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν ἡμετέρων πλημμελημάτων λαμβάνειν τὰς ἀρχάς.*

In the preceding context Socrates insists on the interconnection of political and ecclesiastical mistakes and disasters. He is obliged to ascribe this interconnection not to chance, but to the sins of his generation. Arm. therefore must be right when it reads: *ὥστε με τὸ διάδοχον τούτων μὴ ἔκ τ. σ. γενέσθαι νομίζειν κτλ.* The combination *δύνασθαι νομίζειν* is awkward and otiose.

§ 10 *ἱστορίας ἁπτώμεθα.* Arm. adds: "narrating what we have heard and seen," probably a gloss.

2 § 1 Arm. adds *ἅμα* before *ἀνεκάλει.*

2 § 1 *Μανιχαίους.* Arm. adds: "but that all others should practise their religion however they chose"—probably not a gloss, for Sozomen (VII 1) copying this passage has: *νόμον ἔθετο μετὰ ἀδείας ἑκάστους θρησκεύειν ὡς βούλονται καὶ ἐκκλησιάζειν πλὴν Μανιχαίων κτλ.*

3 § 1 *ὡς ἔφημεν.* Arm. *ὡς καὶ πολλάκις ἔφ.*

4 § 3 *συναχθέντες ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῆς Συρίας.* Arm. has Antioch of Caria, which was the well-known Antioch ad

Macandrum. This is the true text, for Sozomen repeats it (VII 2) *συνελθόντες ἐν Ἀντιοχείᾳ τῆς Καρίας.*

6 § 1 Arm. adds the first words of this chapter *ὅτε κοινῷ* to *μετετίθετο* at end of ch. 5 and omits *τοῦτο μὲν οὕτως ἐγένετο.*

6 § 5 *ἡ παρ' ἐκείνου γεγενημένη καινοτομία.* Arm. *ἐκείνων*, rightly, for the reference is to *ἡ ἀρειανῶν δόξα* in the preceding clause.

7 § 5 *φεύγειν σε καὶ τῶν εὐκτηρίων τόπων κελεύω.* Arm. adds *ὑποχωρεῖν* after *τόπων.* Sozomen copying the passage writes *ἢ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν ὑποχωρεῖν*, and I have not met with this poetical use of the genitive after *φεύγειν* elsewhere in Socrates.

7 § 8 *ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν χωρίζει.* Arm. has *χρῄζει.* So Latin: ecclesiis opus habet. The Florentine and Sfortian codices also have *χρῄζει* which is therefore better attested than *χωρίζει.*

8 § 4 *Ἀσχόλιος.* Here and in 6 § 5 Arm. writes Acholios, which stands also in the codex Sfortianus.

8 § 8 *μᾶλλον ἔφθασαν.* Arm. has *ἔφασαν*, by error.

8 § 9 *ἀπηλάγησαν.* Write *ἀπηλλάγησαν.*

8 § 12 *δι' ὅλου θαυμαζόμενος, καίτοι τὴν τοῦ πραίτωρος χειρίζων ἀρχήν.*

Arm. has *διὸ θαυμ. καὶ τὴν κτλ.*

Valesius saw that *καίτοι* is impossible and conjectured *καὶ τότε* from Nicephorus, who however read *δι' ὅλου* which he paraphrased by *διὰ πάντων.*

8 § 14 *ταῖς ὑπερορίοις ἐκκλησίαις μὴ ὑπερβαίνειν.* Arm. renders *ὑπερβαίνειν* "go out to," and justifies Valesius' conjecture *ἐπιβαίνειν.*

10 § 5 *Μερογαύδου τὸ δεύτερον καὶ Σατορνίλου.* Arm. Merobaudis secundum et Saturnini. So also Sozomen VII 12.

10 § 9 *ἀναγνώστην ὑπ' αὐτῷ Σισίννιον ὄνομα.* Arm. adds *τῶν* after *ἀναγνώστην* which the context requires. It vanished

by reason of *-τήν* preceding it. Sozomen (VII 12) writes: *ἄνδρα τῶν ὑπ' αὐτὸν ἀναγνωστῶν τότε Σισίννιον ὀνόματι.*

10 § 11 *μάρτυρας δὲ καλέσειν τὰς ἐκδόσεις τῶν παλαιῶν.* For *ἐκδόσεις* Arm. reads *παραδόσεις* which the sense requires. Latin has ex traditione veterum.

ibidem after *παλαιῶν* Arm. adds *ἐξηγητῶν καὶ διδασκάλων,* which is perhaps a gloss, though Sozomen in the same context (VII 12) uses the phrase *τῶν παλαιοτέρων ἐξηγήσεις.*

10 § 11 *λόγον ποτὲ ποιοῦνται.* Arm. mistook *λόγον* for *τόπον* and renders accordingly.

10 § 11 *ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προσαρμοσάντων διδασκάλων.* Arm. confirms Valesius' conjecture *προσακμασάντων,* based on the Latin: qui ante divisionem floruissent.

10 § 12 *καὶ εἰ τοῦτο τολμῆσαι ποιήσωσιν.* This yields no sense. Arm. has *καὶ εἰ τ. ποιῆσαι τολμήσωσιν* and Latin: et si hoc facere non auderent.

10 § 13 *δόξα μαρτυρηθήσεται.* Arm. adds "to be true and firm," probably a gloss.

10 § 15 *τὸν σκοπὸν ἐδήλωσε.* Arm. adds *τοῖς αἱρεσιάρχαις,* which is borne out by the Latin: Deinde convocatis haeresiarchis interrogavit an, etc.

10 § 19 *ἄλλοι γὰρ ἄλλως εἶχον.* Arm. *εἶπον.*

10 § 22 *γνωρίζειν τὸν ὅρον αὐτῶν.* Valesius conjectured *αὐτῷ* which is read in Nicephorus and confirmed by Arm.

10 § 32 *Αἰγύπτιοι μὲν γὰρ καὶ οἱ ἐξ Ἀραβίας καὶ Κύπρου πάλιν συμπράττοντες.* For *πάλιν* Arm. has *Παυλίνῳ,* which must be right.

12 § 3 *Ῥιχομηλίου.* Arm. and Latin *Ῥιχομηρίου.*

14 § 7 *Ναυατιανοὺς τὸ ὁμοούσιον φρονοῦντας.* Arm. *Ναυατιανοὺς τοὺς ὁμοφρονοῦντας.*

14 § 8 *τὸν Σύμμαχον ἀπέλυσε τοῦ ἐγκλήματος.* Arm. adds words such as the following: *ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ τῆς Ῥώμης ἐπίσκοπος νοσῶν ἐτύγχανεν, τούτου ἕνεκα ὁ Λέων* (sc. *Λεόντιος*) *παρεκάλει τὸν βασιλέα.*

This must be a Greek gloss from the hand of someone who desired to explain why the Novatian bishop, rather than the orthodox Pope of Rome, took the lead in petitioning the emperor to shew clemency to Symmachus.

17 § 1 *τοῦ Σαράπιδος λουομένου.* Read *λυομένου.*

17 § 1 *τῷ καλουμένῳ ἱερογλυφικῷ.* Arm. *τῶν καλουμένων ἱερογλυφικῶν.* So Latin: quae apud Aegyptos vocantur sacrae.

18 § 2 *ὁ τῇ πόλει χορηγούμενος ἄρτος.* Arm. *ὁ τοῖς πολλοῖς χ. ἄ.* The corn dole is spoken of, so that the Arm. reading is suitable; but Latin renders universae civitati, and Nicephorus (VII 22) read *τῇ πόλει.*

19 § 1 *τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆς μετανοίας περιελεῖν πρεσβυτέρους.* Arm. renders *ἐπισκόπους*, perhaps because in the Armenian Church, where the old penitentiary rite survived for centuries longer, a bishop took the place assigned in it at Rome to a presbyter.

19 § 2 Arm. confirms the reading *τῷ ἐκκλησιαστικῷ κανόνι* which Valesius restored.

19 § 11 *πρὸς τὸν Εὐδαίμονα πρότερον ἔφην.* Arm. renders *πρότερον* in the sense prorsus, utique, omnino. Valesius notes: quid significet *πρότερον*, non satis video.

19 § 12 *τοῖς ἔργοις τοῖς ἀκάρποις.*
Arm. *ἀκαθάρτοις* which is read in Origen and other early witnesses in Ephesians v 11.

21 § 6 *Σαββάτιος.* Arm. and Latin (quidam) add *τίς.*

21 § 11 *βέλτιον ἦν.* Valesius conjectured *βέλτιον εἶναι*, which Arm. involves.

21 § 12 *ἐν Ἀγγάρῳ.* Arm. and Latin *Σαγγάρω*, so also Nicephorus.

21 § 14 *τοὺς ἐγγὺς τῶν Ἀποστόλων.* Arm. *τ. ἐγ. τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν*, which must be a blunder.

21 § 17 *ἐπετέλει τοῦ πάσχα.* Arm. *ἐπ. τὸ π.* as conjectured by Valesius.

22 § 5 *παρατηρεῖσθαι ἡμέρας.* Arm. adds *καὶ χρόνους. ibidem* read *κολοσσεῖς* for *κολασσεῖς.*

22 § 8 *ὁ ἀπόστολος.* Arm. *οἱ ἀπόστολοι* which better agrees with the plural verb *ἐπέθηκαν*, though Latin has *ὁ ἀπόστολος.*

22 § 25 *περὶ τῆς ἑορτῆς τοῦ πάσχα μέρος.* Arm. inserts here: *εἰ εὔκαιρόν ἐστι λέγειν* or similar.

22 § 29 *μᾶλλον κατὰ χώρας.* Arm. adds *ὥσπερ ἔφην.*

22 § 30 *τὴν αὐτὴν περὶ τούτων δόξαν.* Arm. *τ. αὐ. περὶ τοῦ θείου δ.* which is exactly the restitution conjectured by Valesius, save that he gives *θεοῦ* for *θείου.*

22 § 38 *διάφορον ἔχουσι τὴν ἑστίασιν.* Arm. *ἀδιάφορον.* Latin: sine discretione.

22 § 38 *μυρίαι αἰτίαι.* Latin renders *αἰτίαι* by consuetudines, Arm. by "observances."

22 § 39 *ἐπέτρεψαν οἱ Ἀπόστολοι.* Arm. adds *δι' ἐγκράτειαν*, which is not amiss.

ibidem. ἵνα ἕκαστος μὴ φόβῳ. Arm. adds *τοῦ νόμου.*

22 § 49 Arm. punctuates thus *γενόμενος· ἦν νόμῳ*, and has *ἐγάμησεν* for *γαμήσας.*

22 § 50 *ἃ νέος ὢν ἔταξε.* Arm. *συνέταξε.* Nicephorus here *συνετάξατο.*

22 § 55 *τοῖς ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει.* Arm. adds *Ναυατιανοῖς*—perhaps an explanatory gloss.

22 § 56 After *θρησκείαις* Arm. omits *τῶν εὐχῶν.*

22 § 61 *τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν προεστῶτες.* Arm. adds *οἳ πρὸς οἰκείαν πρόληψιν τοῖς ὑπηκόοις ὑπετύπωσαν* or similar, words which do not appear to be a mere gloss.

22 § 64 *τοὺς λαοὺς εἰς συμφωνίαν ἐσπούδασαν πρὸς τοὺς πολλῷ πλείονας.*

For *λαοὺς* Arm. has *ὀλίγους* which is obviously right.

22 § 69 *ἀπαγγέλλοντας ταῦτα.* Arm. *τὰ αὐτά.*

22 § 74 *περὶ τοὺς τύπους.* Arm. *τόπους.*

22 § 79 *τὰ συμβαίνοντα ἐν τοῖς σώμασι.* Arm. om. *ἐν* which is superfluous. Nicephorus also omits.

22 § 81 *ἡ ἐκκλησία οὐκ ἐνέμεινε τῇ γενομένῃ πρώτῃ διαίρεσει.* Arm. read *διαιρουμένη* or *διαιρεθεῖσα* for *οὐκ*, which last stands in the codices and was by error omitted in the text as printed by Valesius and Reading.

23 § 9 *τῇ ὁμοουσίῳ πίστει προσέθεντο.* Arm. adds: "and were settled in our most holy church being re-ordained bishops by Nectarius," which seems no mere gloss.

23 § 10 *ἐπὶ τριακονταπέντε ἔτη.* So Sozomen: Arm. has 30; Latin 25 years.

ibidem. ἐπὶ τῆς ὑπατείας τοῦ νέου Θεοδοσίου. Arm. has *ἐπὶ τ. βασιλείας κτλ.* So also Latin: sub imperio.

25 § 3 *Ἀρβογάστην.* Arm. spells: Argobastes.

25 § 4 *εὐνούχους ἐπεισελθόντες.* Arm. *ὑπεισελθόντες.* Latin: corrumpentes.

25 § 5 *ὅσα εἰκὸς ἦν ὑπὸ τυράννου γίνεσθαι.* Arm. adds *ἄτοπα* after *τυράννου.*

25 § 9 *ηὐτρεπίζετο.* Arm. adds *ὁ τύραννος*—an explanatory gloss.

25 § 10 Arm. omits *ὃς ἀπέχει.*

ibidem after *συνεπλέκοντο* Arm. adds *κατ' ἐκεῖνο.*

25 § 15 *τῇ ἕκτῃ.* Latin has septimo decimo die.

Book VI.

Prooemium § 6 *ἐστι πικρὸν, ὅτι μή.* Arm. adds *ἢ* before *ὅτι μή* which the sense needs.

2 The Arm. text of ch. 2 § 4—3 § 5 inclusive is lost.

2 § 6 *δισσὰς αὐτῷ ἐπιστολὰς ἐνεχείρισεν, ἐντειλάμενος προσενεγκεῖν τῷ νικήσαντι καὶ τὰ δῶρα καὶ τὰ γράμματα.*

Latin renders: duplices misit epistolas, mandans ut alteras

litteras non vincenti daret: porro victori et munera et alteras porrigeret litteras.

It would seem as if, after *ἐντειλάμενος*, a clause had dropt out through similar ending, viz.: *τῷ μὴ νικήσαντι τὰ ἕτερα γράμματα προσενεγκεῖν, τῷ δὲ νικήσαντι καὶ τὰ δῶρα καὶ τὰ ἕτερα γράμματα.*

The conquered was to receive one letter, the conqueror the other *plus* the gifts.

2 § 8 *ἐπικλέψαντος.* Latin adds: demonstravit Imperatori, i.e. *καὶ τῷ βασιλεῖ δείξαντος.*

2 § 9 *ἔφευγεν.* Latin adds: caelare volens quod fuerat ei mandatum, which can hardly be a gloss.

2 § 13 *ᾖ ἐπετέλουν.* Correct to *ἦν.*

3 § 5 *Σελευκείας τῆς ἐν Ἰσαυρίᾳ.* Arm. has *ἐν Συρίᾳ*, wrongly.

3 § 9 *Βασιλείῳ τῷ ποτὲ μὲν διακόνῳ.* Arm. has *τότε* for *ποτέ.* So Latin: tunc.

4 § 3 *ἐνῆγε δὲ αὐτόν.* Arm. *ἄλλον* for *αὐτόν.*

4 § 6 *τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον συνεσθίειν τινὶ, μηδὲ καλούμενον ἐφ' ἑστίαν παραγίνεσθαι.* Arm. has *ἑστίασιν*, which is clearly right.

4 § 7 *ὡς εἴη ἐμπαθής.* The epithet *ἐμπαθής* can only mean "passionate," whereas the context needs the sense "delicate, weak in health." Therefore restore *ἀσθενής* which Arm. involves and Nicephorus implies, for he paraphrases: *ἀσθενῶς περὶ τὸ πέττειν.*

4 § 8 *ὅπως δὲ ἀληθείας ἂν εἶχε τὸ γινόμενον.* Arm. renders *τὸ γιν.* as if it were *οὐκ ἔχομεν λέγειν*—erroneously.

4 § 9 *σφόδρα.* Arm. renders *σοφίᾳ* or *σοφῶς*, erroneously.

5 § 1 *ἐξελέγχειν ἐπείρατο.* Arm. uses past tense of *ἐπαίρομαι. ibidem. φθόνος πλείων ἐξήπτετο.* Arm. adds: *ὥστε τελειωθῆναι ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τὸν τῆς σοφίας λόγον ὃν λέγουσι* (Prov. ix 8)· *μὴ ἔλεγχε αὐτούς, ἵνα μὴ μισήσωσί σε.*

5 § 3 *πρῶτος εὐνούχων.* Arm. and Latin omit *εὐνούχων* which is otiose.

5 § 11 Ἰωάννου. Arm. omits the name and substitutes *εὐλάβεια καί*.

6 § 4 *τοὺς δε αὐτῷ ἐπιτηδείους*. Arm. *τῶν δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπιτηδείων*.

6 § 4 *τούτους ἔχειν*, Arm. *ἀρχὴν ἔχειν*. Valesius conjecturally restored the entire passage thus: *τοὺς δὲ αὐτῷ ἐπιτηδείους τῶν στρατιωτικῶν ἀριθμῶν ἀρχὰς ἔχειν παρεσκεύαζεν*.

6 § 5 Arm. spells Τριτιβιγίλδου.

6 § 6 ἔπειτα ὁ. Arm. *ἐπεὶ δὲ ὁ*.

6 § 7 *κινδυνεύειν ἐμελλε*. Arm. adds: "unless God had saved the menaced empire of the Romans."

6 § 9 Σατορνῖνον. Arm. Saturnilus.

6 § 9 *οὓς ἐπενόει ἐκκόψειν*. Arm. *οἷς ἐκέλευσεν ἐκκόπτειν*, an echo of the words in § 10 *τῇ τοῦ βασιλέως κελεύσει ὑπήκουον*. Valesius conjectured *ὑπενόει*.

6 § 10 *ἐν χωρίῳ ἱπποδρόμῳ*. Arm. adds *καλουμένῳ*, which is needed, and might have dropt out owing to similar ending.

6 § 14 *πολλῶν μυριάδων*. Arm. adds "of Goths," *τῶν Γότθων*.

6 § 28 *μετὰ τὴν τῶν πυλῶν ἀναίρεσιν*. Valesius conjectured *μετὰ τὴν τῶν πυλωρῶν ἀναίρεσιν*, which is what Arm. renders.

6 § 25 *βέλη διεκώλυον*. Arm. has *βέλη οὐ διεκ.*

6 § 31 *ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔφθη*. Arm. renders ἔφθη as if *ἔφθη γνοὺς πάλιν* stood in his text.

6 § 32 *ἑτέρων Ῥωμαίων*. Arm. *αἱ δὲ τῶν*.

6 § 35 *ἐν ἐπιδρομῇ περὶ τοῦ Γαϊνᾶ*. Arm. confirms *περί*, which Valesius conjectured here.

6 § 42 *ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἐλάμβανε*. Arm. adds *κατ' ἔθος*.

7 § 4 *ἀσώματον δὲ αὐτοὺ δογματίσαι*. Arm. renders *ἀσ. δὲ τὸν θεὸν ἐν τῇ ὁμιλίᾳ αὐτοῦ δογμ.* Latin: et deum incorporeum suo dogmate definiret.

7 § 17 *πάντα λίθον κινοῦντα*. Arm. adds: "in order to

the finding and collecting of property. The pious brethren seeing this."

7 § 20 *τὸ προσκεῖσθαι αὐτῷ τοὺς ἀσκητὰς, καὶ περὶ αὐτὸν σέβας ἔχειν.*

Here Arm. involves *αὐτοῖς* and *αὐτούς*. So Latin: quod eos turba diligeret et coleret monachorum.

7 § 29 *ὠριγενιστάς*. Arm. adds *ἄφρονας*.

8 § 4 *ἐρεθισμούς*. Arm. prefixes *βλασφημίας καί*.

8 § 7 *ἐκ τῆς παραλαβούσης*. Arm. suggests *προλαβούσης*.

ibidem. After *συγκρούουσι* Arm. adds: "and they began to throw stones."

9 § 9 *Ἐξάπτεται οὖν πρὸς ὀργὴν ὁ Θεόφιλος καὶ ἀμφοτέρους πρὸς ὀργὴν ἀπήλασεν.*

The second *πρὸς ὀργήν* is otiose. Arm. substitutes *ἐκκλησίας*. So too Latin: expulit ab ecclesia.

9 § 10 *εὐχῶν μετέχειν*. Arm. adds *κατ' ἐκκλησίαν*.

They were admitted into church for the prayers, but not for the sacrament.

10 § 7 *διακοσίων καὶ περί που*. Arm. excludes *καὶ* which is superfluous as Valesius saw.

11 § 6 *αὐτῷ βασιλεῖ*. Arm.: *αὐτῷ τῷ βασιλεῖ* which is better.

11 § 8 The passage *καὶ σφόδρα* to *ἔριν λῦσαι* is lost in the Arm. text.

11 § 9 *καὶ οὕτω—ἡσύχασαν*. Arm. omits and substitutes: "And there arose in consequence dissension in Ephesus on the plea that Heraklides was not worthy of the bishopric."

11 § 13 *ἀφελών*. Arm. adds: "he united them with most holy church and."

11 § 17 *πρὸς τούτοις*. Arm. has *τοῖς παροῦσι* "to those present."

11 § 20 *ὡς καὶ ἡ βασίλισσα*. Arm. *ἕως καὶ ἡ*. Valesius conjectured *ἕως οὗ ἡ*. Sozomen paraphrases: *εἰσότε*.

12 § 3 *οὐκ ἔχων μέν τι λέγειν πρὸς αὐτά, δοκεῖ δὲ αὐτῷ καὶ Θεοφίλῳ ἐκβαλεῖν αὐτά.* Arm. confirms *ἔχων*, which is a conjecture of Valesius for *ἔχω*. For *δοκεῖ* it rightly substitutes *δοκεῖν*. Epiphanius could not say anything against Origen's works, only that he and Theophilus saw fit to condemn them. Valesius conjectured *ἐδόκει*.

12 § 7 *ἔλαθον ἑαυτούς.* Arm. adds: *καὶ τοὺς προπάτορας ἐκβαλόντες τοὺς ἀπὸ τούτων ἐκδεχομένους χρησίμως*, or similar.

13 § 1 *προσέχειν.* Arm. renders "to beware of."

13 § 3 *ἐν Λυκίᾳ.* Arm.: in Pamphylia.

13 § 8 *μαρτυροῦσιν.* Arm. prefixes *οὐ*.

14 § 4 *διαβαλεῖν.* Arm. *ἐκβαλεῖν*, which may be correct.
ibidem. ὡς καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκείνοις τιθέμενον. Arm.: *συντιθέμενον*, which also Latin involves: velut eorum defensori.

14 § 11 *ἀπιὼν ἐτελεύτησεν.* Arm. *ἀπών*. It also renders "in absence died his death" as if *τὴν τελευτήν* had followed. Epiphanius met his deserved fate away from his country.

15 § 8 *γένει Αἰγύπτιος.* Arm. *γένει Κύπριος.*
ibidem. ὅστις πολλά. Arm. and Latin add *κατὰ Ἰωάννου.*

15 § 15 *Δρῦς.* Latin renders Rufini. Sozomen informs us that this oak was called after Rufinus the consul.

15 § 16 *παρεγγράφετο.* Read *παρεγράφετο.*

15 § 18 *μείζονος συνεδρίου.* Arm. adds: "in order that we may know the truth."

15 § 19 *τῇ τρίτῃ.* Arm.: "on the second day."

16 § 7 *Μαριαναί.* Masianae, Arm.

16 § 9 *διδάσκοντος ἀκροᾶσθαι.* Arm. adds the gloss: "the teachings of virtue which he spake by the holy Ghost."

17 § 1 *κατὰ τὴν χειροτονίαν.* Arm. prefixes *τὰ*, as conjectured by Valesius.

18 § 3 *τῆς παιδιᾶς.* Arm. = *τῆς δημώδους π.*

18 § 4 *πάλιν παρασκευάζει.* Arm. adds *ἑτέραν.*

18 § 14 *ἱερατικοῦ τάγματος.* Arm. adds *καὶ λαϊκῶν πλῆθος καὶ τὸ ἅγιον βάπτισμα ἐτέλουν* or similar.

18 § 17 *Ἰουνίου μηνός.* Latin has Ianuarii.

19 § 1 *Ἀρσάκιος.* Arm. spells Ursacius.

19 § 3 *τὸ αὐτὸ ὑπομεῖναι.* Arm. adds *καὶ ἐν κακοῖς ἐτιμωρεῖτο* or similar.

19 § 5 *ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ὑπατείᾳ.* Latin has consulatu eodem Honorii sexto et Aristaeneti. Arm. merely adds Honorii after *ὑπατείᾳ.*

19 § 7 *ἄλλων τινῶν.* Latin adds haereticorum, so also Arm.

19 § 8 *ἀλλὰ πότερον δικαία ἡ καθαίρεσις Ἰωάννου κατὰ τὸν λόγον.* Arm. has *ἀλλὰ λέγω τοῖς τάδε φάσκουσι πότερον δ. ἡ καθ. Ἰωάννου κατὰ τ. λ.*

19 § 8 After *ἡ βασίλισσα ἐτελεύτησεν* Arm. intrudes the following or similar: *τοὺς γὰρ αἱρετικοὺς δέχεσθαι εἴης* (?) *καὶ τὴν ὀρθόδοξον πίστιν στέργειν, εὖ οἶδα, διότι καὶ ὁ θεὸς πρὸς τούτους εὐφραίνεται ἐπὶ τῶν μετανοούντων.*

20 § 2 *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πολλοῦ διαδραμόντος χρόνου.* Arm. has *τετραμήνου* for *πολλοῦ.* Latin: et propterea cum quatuor vacassent menses.

22 § 6 *φορεῖν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον.* Arm. *φ. τὸν ἱερέα καὶ ἐπ.*

22 § 7 *ἔστωσάν σοι ἱμάτια λευκά.* Arm. has *ἀεί* before *λευκά.* So Latin: semper alba.

22 § 12 After *πῶς μετανοεῖς* Arm. omits *ἔφη ὁ Σινίννιος* and rejects *ἀπεκρίνατο* in the next clause. So did Sozomen who paraphrases thus: *ἐρουμένου δὲ Λεοντίου· τίνα τρόπον; ὅτι δε τεθέαμαι ἀπεκρίνατο.*

22 § 14 *ὃς τοῖς ἄλλοις.* Arm. *ὡς τοῖς ἄλλοις.*

22 § 17 Arm. adds *πάντα* before *εἰρημένα.*

22 § 21 *χάρις.* Arm. adds: "of empty manners from being pleasing to mankind."

23 § 5 *φανερώτερόν τε.* Arm. *φαν. τότε.*

ibidem. *ἐπηκολούθει.* Arm. adds: *καὶ ἐδόξαζον τὸν θεὸν λέγοντες.*

23 § 6 *οὕτως ἐγένετο.* Arm. adds: *καὶ ἐμαρτυρήθη θεοφιλὴς εἶναι ὁ βασιλεύς.*

ibidem. *Θεοδόσιον.* Arm. adds *βασιλεύοντα.*

Arm. omits the supplementary chapter commencing *ἐπειδὴ δὲ ἐν τοσούτῳ.*

Book VII.

1 § 3 *οὔσης αὐτῷ σοφίας.* Here *σοφίας* is Valesius' conjecture; it is confirmed by Arm.

2 § 1 *ἐν τῇ Κωνσταντινουπόλει.* Arm. has *ἐν τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ.* So Latin: iam tribus annis Atticus habebat episcopatum.

2 § 4 *καὶ ἐπαγωγός.* Arm. and Latin omit.

3 § 11 *ὡς παραλόγως.* Arm. *παρανόμως.* So Latin iniuste, and Nicephorus.

4 § 2 Arm. omits *πάσης Ἰουδαϊκῆς εὐχῆς.*

4 § 2 *πιστεύσας.* Arm. adds *ἐξ ὅλης καρδίας.*

5 § 7 *συνέρρεον πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐξ ἔθους πολλοί.* Valesius: delenda sunt haec verba *ἐξ ἔθους* quae ex sequente linea perperam huc irrepserunt. Arm. substitutes *σφόδρα.*

5 § 8 *ὑπὲρ τοὺς ἑβδομήκοντα.* Arm. "over 170."

5 § 9 *πολλοὺς τοῦ Σαββατίου.* Arm. *πολλοὺς τοὺς Σ.* or *πολλοὺς τῶν τοῦ Σ.*

6 § 1 Arm. omits *ὡς* after *Ἀρειανῶν.*

ibidem. *ἑκατόν κτλ.* Arm. seems to paraphrase: "having become very old, for he survived to the age of 119 years."

ibidem. Arm. and Latin om. *Αὐγούστου* after *Θεοδοσίου.*

6 § 6 *ὁ δὲ τὸν Ὠριγένην.* Latin adds iugiter as if *διηνεκῶς* or similar had stood in the Greek.

6 § 8 Arm. mistakes *λεληθότως* for *ἐληλυθότες*!

7 § 1 *ληθαργικῷ.* Arm. renders in sense of *στραγγουρία* or stone, his text giving *λιθοεργικῷ.*

7 § 3 *τῷ μέρει* Τιμοθέου. Arm. has *τ. μ.* Κυρίλλου.

7 § 5 Θεόπεμπτον. Arm. and Latin Θεόπομπον.

8 § 12 *εἶπεν τῷ* Μαρουθᾷ.... Arm: "Isdigerdes acquiesced the more in Marutha and ordered him to build a church wherever he liked."

8 § 15 *εἰώθει προσέρχεσθαι.* Arm. *προέρχεσθαι.*

8 § 18 *πεῖραν δεδωκότος ἑτέραν τοῦ* Μαρουθᾶ. Arm. *π. δεδ. ἑτ. θαυμάτων τοῦ* M. So Latin: aliud miraculum. Perhaps the word fell out through similarity to *τοῦ* Μαρουθᾶ which followed.

ibidem. σὺν Ἀνλδᾷ. Arm. Ἀβλαβᾶ, with Latin: Ablaten. Nicephorus has Abda.

8 § 19 Βαραράνην. Arm. Barbanis.

10 § 3 Διαβαίνοντι δὲ *αὐτῷ* Θεσσαλοὶ *ἀντέστησαν.* Arm. has Θεσσαλίαν. So Latin: et transiens Thessaliam.

10 § 9 *μὴ ἐπιχαίρειν ἐν τηλικούτοις κακοῖς μηδὲ χαίρειν.* Arm. has *ἐπιχειρεῖν ἐν.* So Latin: ne mala talia facere tentaret neque caedibus gauderet.

10 § 11 *περὶ τούτου.* Arm. adds: "But now let us return to our original subject."

12 § 1 Σισιννίου δέ. Arm.: *εὐθὺς οὖν ὡς ἔφην Σισιννίου,* or similar.

12 § 8 *πάντα σκόπον τοῦ παρεισδύναι.* Arm. *σκόπῳ.*

12 § 11 *τὸν ἑαυτοῦ γενναιότατον.* Arm. *τὸν αὐτοῦ γενναιότερον.*

13 § 5 *καὶ τοῦτο.* Correct to *καὶ τούτου.* So 1853 ed.

ibidem. ἀντιπαθοῦντες. Arm. *συμπαθοῦντες.*

13 § 7 *γραμμάτων μὲν τῶν πεζῶν.* Arm. *παιδικῶν* for *πεζῶν.* Latin: puerilium.

13 § 11 *διηπείλησε.* Arm. adds: "and wrote an account of the evils to come upon them."

13 § 16 *ἐξελαύνει τῆς πόλεως.* Arm. adds: *τοὺς πολλοὺς φονεύων αὐτῶν* or similar.

13 § 18 Ἀδαμάντιος δέ. Arm. adds τις αὐτῶν, which is needed.

13 § 21 καταιδέσειν. Arm. καταδήσειν, "to bind," which is technical of an oath.

14 § 2 πεντακοσίους. Arm. 300.

14 § 6 ἐξετάσει αὐτὸν ὑπολαβών. Arm. ἐξ. αὐ. ὑποβαλών, of which Valesius notes: procul dubio scribendum est.

15 § 4 πλέον αὐτὴν ᾐδοῦντο. Arm.: πλέον ἐφίλουν αὐτὴν καὶ ᾐδ.

15 § 8 τὰ Χριστοῦ. In the Armenian's codex was written τὰ χῦ, which he renders "swiftly," i.e. ταχύ!

16 § 1 Ἰνμεστάρ. Arm. Immon, which also appears in Theophanes. Latin: Mestar.

17 § 2 τῇ Ῥωμαικῇ. Arm. γραμματικῇ.

17 § 3 τοιοῦτον γὰρ αὐτὸν ἐγὼ κατέλαβον ὄντα. Arm. "For such I found to be his faith."

17 § 6 Arm. mistakes μηκύνειν for μὴ κινεῖν!

17 § 14 Παύλου ἐγένετο. Arm. adds as follows: "But I do not pronounce, but it is incumbent on me to say this much, that he had received from Bishop Atticus true and orthodox baptism, and for that reason God permitted him not to sully the true faith. For of the Arians and Macedonians or of the rest of the heretics, not one has the true faith. So much for that.

But about the same time there took place a persecution of the Christians in Persia by the king there."

18 § 7 Arm. mistakes ἀπολλυμένους for ἀπολυομένους.

18 § 13 οὐχ ὅτε σὺ θέλεις πολεμήσουσι Ῥωμαίων βασιλεῖς. After πολεμήσουσι Arm. supplies the following omitted through similarity of ending in the Greek:

will make battle the Romans,] but whenever they essay to assist their own side. Narses having learned this informed his king of everything, and forthwith, just as he was, the king of Persia made ready to go forth and engage Ardaburius with

a large force. But] the king of the Romans perceiving the Persian to have got ready with all his hosts, entrusting to God, etc.

The omission made havoc of the Greek text, to repair which a scribe changed *βασιλεὺς* into *βασιλεῖς*, inserted *δὲ* after *πάσῃ* before which he added a full stop, and added *ὁ βασιλεὺς* after *ἐννοῶν*.

18 § 14 *πιστεύσας ὁ βασιλεύς*. Latin and Arm. add *τῷ θεῷ*.

ibidem. After *γέγονε δῆλον* Arm. adds *διὰ ταύτην λέγω τὴν αἰτίαν*, or similar.

18 § 18 *Βαραράνης*. Latin Barabanes.

18 § 20 *Ῥωμαίους τε*. Arm. adds *πρεσβεῖς*, "ambassadors."

18 § 21 *περὶ τὰς δέκα μυριάδας*. Latin: plus quam centum millia. So Arm.

18 § 22 *ἐπεχώρησαν*. Latin: reversi sunt, i.e. *ὑπεχώρησαν*.

18 § 23 *Βιτίανος*. So Arm. Latin: Beatianus.

18 § 23 *παρεκβαίνειν δοκῶ*. Arm. adds: "narrating in detail these things."

20 § 2 *Μαξιμῖνον*. Arm. and Latin have Maximus.

20 § 4 *γνωσθέντα νομίζεσθαι*. Arm. *γενόμενα νόμ.*

20 § 10 *πάντες ἐδείχθησαν*. Arm. adds: *ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ πεσόντες*.

20 § 10 *ἀπέκτειναν*. Arm. adds: "who suffered, harassed with divers tortures"—a gloss.

21 § 1 Arm. reads: *τοὺς ὑφ' αὑτῷ κληρικούς· Ἄνδρες, ἔφη, ὁ θεός*, so Nicephorus and Latin. Valesius already conjectured this reform.

21 § 3—22 § 5 inclusive is lost in Arm.

22 § 5 Add *σὺν* before *ταῖς ἑαυτοῦ ἀδελφαῖς*.

22 § 6 *ἐκ τῶν γραφῶν*. Arm.: *ἐκ παλαιῶν γραφῶν*.

22 § 7 Arm. has *τὸ δὲ ἀνεξίκακον καὶ φιλάνθρωπον τίς ἐξηγήσεται; πάντας κτλ.*

ibidem. *φιλοσοφεῖν ἐπαγγειλάμενος.* Arm. adds: "and not to retaliate on anyone."

22 § 8 *συλλογισμοῖς.* Arm. adds: *θεοφιλὴς ἰδίᾳ* or similar.

22 § 10 *οὐ μέγα ἔφη κτλ.* Arm. renders: "It is no great thing nor hard to slay a man; but it is not possible for a man, but only for God, to recall the once dead from repentance, and to make him alive, but only for God who also made man."

22 § 13 *τῷ θεῷ ἱερωμένους.* Arm. renders *θεωρουμένους.*

22 § 14 *πιστεύσας μεταλαβεῖν.* Arm. has *πιστ. δῆθεν ὁ θεοφιλὴς Θεοδόσιος μεταλ.*—probably a gloss.

22 § 16 *τῆς θέας κοινῇ.* Arm. "the voice of praise."

22 § 19 *ἐκ σιτοδείας.* Arm. "by good observance."

ibidem. *τοῖς σύμπασιν.* Arm. adds: "so much did the king's prayer and the multitude's spontaneous obedience avail, praying to our Lord J. C."— a gloss.

23 § 5 *χρῆται τύχῃ καθὼς ἐνομίζετο· ἡ τύχη δὲ ὡς ὕστερον ἐδείχθη.* Arm. has *εὐτυχίᾳ* for *ἡ τύχη* which is better sense. Valesius rendered as if he read *εὐτυχεῖ.*

23 § 12 *περὶ τὸ θεῖον.* Arm. adds *φιλίαν καί.*

23 § 14 *τοῦ ἱπποδρόμου.* Arm. adds *πάντες.*

24 § 1 *τίνα τῶν ἑσπερίων.* Arm. *τίνα ἂν τῶν ἑσπ.*

24 § 4 *τοῖς τυράννοις ῥᾳδίως.* Arm. renders *ῥᾳδίως* "hastily" and adds: "but to stand firm and obey the kings vouchsafed to them by God."

25 § 6 *τοῖς οἰκονομοῦσι καλῶς.* Arm. adds: "make return unto the needy, remembering the saying of our Saviour Christ, who says: give to all who ask of thee."

25 § 6 *θελήσῃς.* Arm. *θελήσω.*

25 § 7 Arm. renders *λογιστεύειν* in sense of "to muzzle."

25 § 8 *κρυβῆναι.* Arm. "to be transferred."

25 § 12 *καὶ Στράβων τε.* Arm. "and especially Strabo the eloquent."

25 § 13 *εὐτερπῇ.* Read *εὐτερπῆ.* So 1853 ed.

25 § 19 *ἁμαρτίαι πρὸς θάνατον.* Latin: delicta *quae ducunt* ad mortem. So Arm.

ibidem. Arm. excludes *πρός* before *τοὺς κληρικούς.*

ibidem. *συγχώρησιν αὐτῶν ἐπιτρέποντες.* Armenian adds the following:

"Atticus however raised the objection afresh to him, that no other (sin) is unto death of soul and body, save only idolatry and avarice. Avarice to wit, cupidity, this many of your (sect) are found to have. I mean that some (of you) tolerate (*lit.* admit) avarice as being supporters of grandees, while others reject because of fornication; and this when they know it (?), but if not, through forgetfulness; children participate in the divine mysteries, because of reverence on the part of their parents, and husbands by reason of their wives' modesty, and wives because of their husbands. But mark, as you have said, there is no remission (of sins) unto death among you; but, as I have already said, it is that you are holden by fear and shame of men. And having said this he dismissed Asclepiades, for he had come to visit Atticus."

The above must have formed an integral part of Socrates' text. It had already fallen out in the copies used by Nicephorus, and by the Latin translator Epiphanius. The sense is somewhat obscure here and there. The general purport of Atticus' objections was to shew that the Novatianists were not so strict in practice as the rigour of their canons would lead men to suppose. In practice they admitted to the sacraments not only the avaricious, but fornicators. The clause: "and this when they know it, but if not, then through forgetfulness" seems to cohere with what precedes and not with what follows it. Even if they excluded from the sacraments sinners of these two classes, while their sins were notorious, they nevertheless admitted them later on when their delinquencies were forgotten. Things were allowed to blow over in the Novatianist, no less than in the Catholic churches. The word which I render as "supporters" (of grandees) more usually means "regulators," "constitutors."

The rest of the passage seems to mean that children, too young for proper initiation, were admitted to the sacraments

by reason of their parents' piety; men, who were mortal sinners, because of their wives' good repute, and women by reason of the virtues of their husbands. Without such concessions to human nature, it is difficult to understand how the Puritan Churches could have retained their popularity so late as the age of Socrates.

25 § 20 *ἐπὶ τὴν Κωνσταντινούπολιν.* Arm. adds *εἰ θέλεις.* So also Latin: Si vivum me denuo videre desideras.

26 § 3 *ὑπὲρ δύναμιν.* Arm. adds.: "to warm," fovere, perhaps rightly.

27 § 3 *τοῦ βασιλέως Ἰουλιανοῦ.* Arm. adds *κατὰ Χριστιανῶν.*

27 § 9 *οἱ ἰδιῶται μὲν γὰρ τὸ κεκομψευμένον τῆς φράσεως ἰδεῖν οὐκ ἰσχύουσιν.*

ἰδεῖν is strange. Arm. has "to bear," "to tolerate." Nicephorus paraphrases thus: *τὸ κομψὸν οὐ συνορῶσι τῆς φράσεως.* Perhaps *συνιδεῖν* was written by Socrates.

28 § 1 *Πρόκλον.* Arm. adds: "whom I mentioned just now."

29 § 3 *εἰς διδασκαλίαν ἔγνωσαν.* Arm. adds: "and therefore desired," *καὶ τούτου ἕνεκα ἐθέλησαν,* which may have fallen out by reason of similar ending; but Nicephorus had the Greek text as it stands.

29 § 10 *ἐπειρᾶτο.* Arm. as before mistakes this for *ἐπήρετο.*

30 § 6 *κατὰ τῶν τυράννων.* Arm. *κατὰ τῶν Οὔννων,* of which Valesius, *ex conjectura,* noted: procul dubio scribendum est.

ibidem. Οὔπταρος. Latin: Suptarus.

30 § 7 *Βάρβας ὁ τῶν Ἀρειανῶν.* Arm. has B. *ὁ τῶν Ναυατιανῶν.*

ibidem. Arm. has the order: *Θεοδοσίου τὸ τρίτον καὶ Οὐαλεντινιανοῦ τὸ τρισκαιδέκατον.*

31 § 1 *καὶ ἄλλως ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις ἑαυτὸν μισεῖσθαι.* Valesius conjectured *καὶ ἄλλους ἐν τ. τ. ἑ. μισεῖσθαι,* which is exactly what Arm. involves.

31 § 2 *καὶ πειθόμενος τῇ* Νεστορίου...*ὁρμῇ*. Arm. *καὶ πυθόμενος τὴν* Ν....*ὁρμὴν καὶ αὐτὸς τοὺς περὶ* Γέρμην. The latter words dropt out through the similar endings *ὁρμήν*] [*γέρμην*. Latin testifies that the text ran as above, for it renders: cognoscens instantiam Nestorii...et ipse etc.

31 § 2 *τοῦ Πατριάρχου πρόσταξιν*. Arm. *τοῦ Π. πρᾶξιν*.

32 § 4 *μηδαμῶς αὐτὸν τῆς οἰκονομίας, ὡς ἄνθρωπον, χωρίζειν ἐκ τῆς θεότητος*.

Arm. has: *μηδαμῶς αὐτοῦ τὸν τῆς οἰκονομίας ἄνθρωπον χωρίζειν κτλ*., which is clearly right. But Latin: nullatenus eum per dispensationem velut hominem.

ibidem. Arm.: *ἐγνώκαμεν Χριστόν ποτε κατὰ σάρκα*.

32 § 6 *διαίρεσις*. Arm. adds "lawless," *ἄνομος*.

32 § 9 *λόγοις δοθεῖσιν*. Arm. *ἐκδοθεῖσιν*, as conjectured by Valesius.

32 § 12 *παλαιῶν ἑρμηνεύων*. Arm. *π. ἑρμηνειῶν*. Valesius conjectured *ἑρμηνέων*. Lat.: antiquorum interpretum. Perhaps we should read *ἑρμηνευτῶν*.

32 § 15 *ὃ λύει*. Arm. *ὃ χωρίζει*. So in § 16 *χωρίζειν ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ*.

33 § 1 *ἀπηνοῦς τοῦ δεσπότου πειρώμενοι*. So Nicephorus and Latin: dominum crudelem experti. But the Arm. shifts the blame on to the barbarous slaves and reads: *ἀπειθεῖς τῷ δεσπότῃ γενόμενοι*.

33 § 5 In the first of the iambics Arm. omits *τά* and in the second with Nicephorus reads *τι* for *ἐν* before *ναοῖς*, so restoring the metre. Nicephorus reads *σημεῖα καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα* in the first.

33 § 6 *ὁ εἰπών*. Arm. *ὃ εἶπεν*.

34 § 3 *εἶχε πρὸς αὐτόν*. Arm. adds: having a grudge against him because he was brave in speech and ready of answer in his utterances.

34 § 4 *θεολογούντων τὸν Χριστόν*. Arm. *θ. τὸν Ἰησοῦν*.

34 § 7 *κρίναντες εὐτόνως βλασφημήσαντα.* Arm. *κρ. αὐτὸν ὡς βλ.* So Latin: vindicantes eum velut blasphemantem.

34 § 10 *εἰς κοινωνίαν προβᾶσαν.* Arm.: *εἰς πανουργίαν προβ.* or similar. Perhaps *κακουργίαν.* So Latin: ad quandam perniciem.

34 § 12 *τῇ εἰκάδι ὀγδόῃ.* Arm.: "on the 22nd."

34 § 14 *κατὰ τὰς ἐκκλησίας.* Arm. *κατὰ τῆς ἐκ.*

35 § 2 After *πιστευθέν* Arm. intrudes *ἐπεχείρει* or similar.
ibidem. Μαξιμιανός. Arm. Maximus.

36 § 1 *ἤδη τῆς Κυζίκου ὀνομασθέντα ἐπίσκοπον.* Arm. *εἰ δὴ* for *ἤδη.* So perhaps Latin: cum Cyzici fuisset ordinatus.

36 § 2 *ἢ κατασκεύασθαι.* Arm.: *ἢ καταψεύσασθαι.*

36 § 4 *χρεία ἐκάλει.* Arm. adds: unto the well doing of the Church.

36 § 5 *οἱ τὸν Πρόκλον.* Arm. *οἱ τότε τὸν Π.*

36 § 6 *ὁ κανὼν οὗτος.* Latin adds: Regula XVIII.

36 § 7 Arm. orders: *τῆς λειτουργίας καὶ τῆς τιμῆς μόνον, μηδὲν κτλ.*

36 § 13 Δοσίθεον. Arm. Dorotheum.
ibidem. Arm. Ῥεβερέντιος. Reverentius.
ibidem. *εἰς Τύρον.* Arm.: "those in Tyre desiring him."

36 § 14 Παλλάδιος. Arm. adds: "having in prayer approached the theotokos Mariam in the island called Artak."

36 § 15 Θεόφιλος. Arm. Θεοσέβιος. So Latin.
ibidem. *εἰς Ἀδριανούς.* Arm. adds *τῆς Φρυγίας.*
ibidem. Arm. mistakes Ἀπαμείας for *ἀπὸ μιᾶς*!
ibidem. Εὐδοξιουπόλιν. Arm. adds *τῆς Θράκης.*
ibidem. Arm. has Silumbria for Σαλαμβρίαν; Strabo and Stephanus call it Σηλυμβρία.
ibidem. Σεξανταπρίστων. Arm. and Latin: Antapristena.

36 § 16 Ἀγδαμίας. Latin: Argadamia. Arm. Gdanaios.

37 § 3 *τρεῖς ἐνιαυτούς.* Arm. *δύο ἐν.* And adds *ὅλους.*

37 § 17 *ἀπήλασεν.* Arm. *ἀπήλλασσεν* or *ἀπήλλαξεν,* as conjectured by Valesius.

37 § 18 *Σιλβανοῦ.* Arm. adds: *καὶ ἄλλων ἐπισκόπων.*

37 § 19 *Μαξιμιανοῦ.* Arm. Maximus, as above.

38 Arm. omits this chapter.

39 *Μικρὸν δὲ μετὰ τόνδε τὸν χρόνον.* Arm.: *τότε δὲ.*

39 § 7 *ὁ σύμπας ἐμπρησμός.* Arm. *ὁ συμβὰς ἐμπ.* which is better; cp. *τὸ συμβὰν θαῦμα* in § 11.

39 § 11 *τῶν Ἑλληνιζόντων οἱ πλείονες.* Arm. adds: "For truly is the spot holy, for the reason that in the persecutions of the orthodox faith by the emperors Constantius and Valens, of all the churches under persecution it remained unsullied by the unholy Arians and Macedoniani. Wherefore then we also together with the Novatiani that are orthodox there send up prayers and adoration to God who loveth mankind—this place of the prayers of the rescuer (*or* redeemer) in the midst of the flaming fire."

Perhaps the open adherence to the Novatianist Church here professed by Socrates led to the excision from his text of the above passage.

40 § 1 *πέντε μησίν.* Latin: sex.

40 § 4 *τοῦτο γὰρ.* Arm. *τότε γάρ.* Valesius conjectured *τούτῳ.*

41 § 2 *προκόψαντα δὲ αὐτόν.* Arm. adds "in literary composition."

41 § 4 *πλέον ἢ ἐκεῖνος ἐξήσκησεν.*
Some MSS. have *πλ. ἦν ἐκ. εἶχεν.* Arm. involves *πλέον ἢ ἐκεῖνος εἶχεν.*

41 § 5 *τούτῳ δέ.* Arm. omits *δέ.* Valesius conjectured *δή.*

42 § 2 *ἐπὶ Μωϋσέως.* Arm. involves *διὰ Μωϋσέως.* Valesius suggested *περί.*

43 § 6 *Πρόκλος.* Arm. *Κύριλλος.*

43 § 8 Arm. reads *ἐπὶ ἄρχοντα Μισόχι,* omitting *Γώγ* and *Ῥώς.*

43 § 9 *μεγαλυνθήσομαι.* Arm. adds: "and I will be holy," *ἁγιασθήσομαι.*

43 § 10 *Πρόκλος.* Arm. *Κύριλλος.*

45 § 2 *ἐν Κομάνοις.* Arm. adds *τοῦ Εὐξείνου Πόντου.*

45 § 4 *πεισθέντες οὖν.* Arm. has "gladdened."

45 § 6 *διήνεγκεν.* Arm. "continued," *διετέλεσεν.*

45 § 7 *οὐ διαφεύγει.* Arm. adds: "being well aware that envy can work many ills, but love towards God with virtue knoweth how to prevent envy and the scandals which arise therefrom, and renders more illustrious also them that persevere in the love and salvation of the Lord."

46 § 1 *Ναυατιανῶν ἐκκλησίας.* Arm. adds *ἐπίσκοπος* which is needed.

46 § 9 *ἀπεδήμει δὲ τηνικαῦτα.* Arm. adds: "in Tiberias of Phrygia," perhaps an inference on the translator's part from § 13 below.

46 § 10 *τάδε ἔφη πρὸς αὐτόν.* Arm. "he said this appointing him for the task."

ibidem. παρακαταθήκην. Arm. *διαθήκην.*

46 § 12 *τρίτῃ οὖν.* Arm. "on the second."

46 § 13 *μίαν καὶ εἰκάδα.* Arm. "thirty-first."

47 § 2 *καὶ γὰρ αὐτήν.* Arm. *αὐτή.* So Latin: hoc enim et ipsa etc.

ibidem. ἐπόψηται. Arm. adds: "and if she were given to Valentinus whom the emperor had appointed to the western regions."

47 § 3 *ποικίλως.* Arm.: "with divers buildings."

ibidem. ἐπανιοῦσα. Arm. adds: "she liberally distributed rations in the name of the poor, until she obtained and was held worthy of homage, of all holinesses, and returned."

48 § 4 *χειρίσας ἀρχήν.* Arm. *ἐγχειρίσας ἀρχήν.* So Latin: praefecturam Illyrici administraverat.

48 § 6 *ηὐπορήσαμεν.* Arm. wrongly: *ἠπορήσαμεν.*

ibidem. προῄρηντο. Arm. adds: *μὴ συναψάντες τὸ ἔργον,* or similar.

F. C. CONYBEARE.

ON SOME ANCIENT PLANT-NAMES. II.

10. ὀζαινῖτις. Plin. *N. H.* 12. 42.

This is a ἅπαξ λεγόμενον. Pliny after describing nard adds 'alterum ejus genus apud Gangen nascens damnatur in totum ozænitidos nomine, virus redolens.' Liddell and Scott following Valpy's Stephanus invent an adjective ὀζαινίτης, of which they make ὀζαινῖτις the feminine, and define it to mean 'smelling like an ὄζαινα, name of a plant.' They explain ὄζαινα itself as (i) a fetid polypus in the nose: (ii) a strong-smelling sea-polypus. Pliny was acquainted with both meanings. In *N. H.* 24. 113, he speaks of 'tætra oris ulcera et ozænas' and in 25. 165 of their treatment. In *N. H.* 9. 89 we have, 'polyporum generis est ozæna dicta a gravi capitis odore, ob hoc maxime murenis eam consectantibus.' Gravis is a favourite word with Pliny and by no means in the sense of offensive; thus we have of wormwood, habrotonum odore jucunde gravi, *N. H.* 21. 60. As a matter of fact the 'sea-polypus' has been identified with a sea-cuttlefish, *Eledone moschata*, presumably smelling of musk. It could not have been very offensive as Aristotle calls it ὄζολις, and Aristophanes ὀσμύλη.

The strength of Pliny's language confirms the generally accepted opinion that it was the first meaning he had in view. It may be remarked that Liddell and Scott are in error in describing ὄζαινα as a nasal polypus. Galen distinctly says it was not. It was in fact an ulceration of the ethmoid bone, the revolting effect of which is amply described by the ancient medical writers. ὄζαινα and cognate words came to be proverbial for something intolerably offensive.

Nard itself was an odoramentum collected in the Himalaya. The plant yielding it belongs to the Valerian family; it was

costly and other Valerians both European and Indian supplied cheaper substitutes. One of these was Celtic nard (*Valeriana celtica*) a native of Styria whence it is still exported to Turkey and the East; it is the saliunca of Vergil (*Buc.* 5. 17). It is practically certain that ὀζαινῖτις was some Indian Valerian used as a nard-substitute. It must be admitted that the Valerian-odour does not appeal to the modern sense of smell. Yet this is a long way from the horrible suggestion implied by Pliny. One may well look therefore for some more plausible explanation.

We may clear the ground by discarding the non-existent ὀζαινίτης. We have then only ὀζαινῖτις to deal with. The first thing that suggests itself is that this is in form a female plant-appellative containing a place-name. We have an example in ἡ καλουμένη βάτος Μοσυλῖτις, Diosc. 1. 13, the name of a kind of κασσία. It is a well-known fact, scarcely needing illustration, that trade-products often take their name, not from their place of origin, but from the entrepôt whence they pass into commerce. That this explains Μοσυλῖτις is clear from Pliny, *N. H.* 6. 174, promunturium et portus Mossylites, quo cinnamum devehitur.

The Periplus M. R. § 48 gives the clue. It records the πόλις λεγομένη Ὀζήνη and continues, κατάγεται δὲ δι' αὐτῆς καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἄνω τόπων ἡ...καταφερομένη νάρδος, and then enumerates the various sorts of which, as of other drugs, it was the entrepôt. It is the modern Ujain, in the State of Gwalior, and now the centre of the opium trade. Some sort of a fully-flavoured nard would find its way westward from it as ὀζηνῖτις and someone would hazard the etymology which Pliny accepts with horror.

11. ἐλαίαγνος, Theophr. *H. P.* 4. 10. 2.

Theophrastus was essentially a naturalist; he observes and his conclusions are based on what he has seen. Later science has added to them, but does not disturb their validity. Thus he was the founder of Œcology, the branch of Botany which studies plants in relation to their physical environment. He

lays down the principle:—*διαιρεῖν δὲ χρὴ καὶ ταῦτα κατὰ τοὺς τόπους, οἷον εἰ τὰ μὲν ἕλεια τὰ δὲ λιμναῖα τὰ δὲ ποτάμια μᾶλλον ἢ καὶ κοινὰ πάντων τῶν τόπων*, *H. P.* 4. 10. 1. Yet it was not till the latter half of the last century that any progress has been made in the detailed study of the subject.

Theophrastus saw that plants widely differing in habit are grouped in what are now called 'Formations.' These are communities, the individuals of which are satisfied by particular local conditions. The commonest of these are wetness and dryness: Theophrastus anticipated the modern distinction into hygrophilous and xerophilous:—*διαιρεῖν δὲ καὶ ποῖα ταὐτὰ ἐν τῷ ὑγρῷ καὶ τῷ ξηρῷ φύεται.*

As an illustration of a hygrophilous formation, he studies the vegetation of Lake Copais. Among the plants he enumerates is *ἐλαίαγνος*. Probably in his time, as now, the lake was drained in summer and only filled with water in winter and spring. One result would be that, as in other cases, soil with vegetation attached would be lifted from the bottom or detached from the sides and form floating islands; on these the *ἐλαίαγνος* grew:—*φύεται δὲ ὁ πλεῖστος μὲν ἐπὶ τῶν πλοάδων νήσων*, *H. P.* 4. 10. 2.

What was it? Liddell and Scott have, 'a Bœotian marsh-plant, perhaps *myrica, sweet gale* (diff. from *μυρίκη*).' Now *μυρίκη* or myrica is tamarisk, and it was certainly not that. Nor was it sweet-gale, *Myrica Gale* (Linnæus in his arbitrary fashion having applied the name to a plant of different affinity), for this is only northern and unknown in the South.

The name itself occurs nowhere but in this passage in Theophrastus; one may conjecture that it was a local name just as *σίδη*, which he also mentions with it, was for *νυμφαία*. But according to Stephanus, in its currently accepted form, it was due to Marcellus. Apparently he thought it was a kind of *ἄγνος*, *Vitex Agnus-castus*, with which it can have no affinity or relationship. For *ἄγνος* proper had *φύλλα ὡσπερεὶ ἐλαίας*, Diosc. 1. 103; but Theophrastus is careful to say that *ἐλαίαγνος* had *φύλλον...μαλακὸν δὲ ὥσπερ αἱ μηλέαι καὶ χνοώδες*. As Stephanus acutely points out it is what Pliny, *N. H.* 24. 59, had in view by his second kind of

agnus, 'minor ramosa, foliis candidioribus, lanuginosis.' It is abundantly clear that it had no sort of resemblance either to ἄγνος or the olive.

Bodæus, 461, pointed out as long ago as 1644 that the true form of the name was ἑλέαγνος which is preserved by Hesychius and is given as an alternative by Liddell and Scott without the aspirate. It is simply agnus palustris; as Theophrastus says, φύσει μὲν θαμνώδες καὶ παρόμοιον τοῖς ἄγνοις. Bodæus identifies the plant without difficulty as a willow. It was a dwarf shrub or a floating island would not have carried it; ἄνθος δὲ τῷ τῆς λεύκης ὅμοιον ἔλαττον, it had catkins like the white poplar only smaller. When mature these liberate the white fluffy seeds; the shrub covered with them might well suggest a lamb. It was in fact our common goat-willow, *Salix Caprea*. In Devon it is called lamb's-tails from the catkins. The rustic mind works in such matters everywhere alike.

12. βύσσος, Paus. 5. 5. 2.

This passage is credited with having given rise to "enormous controversy"; it may argue some temerity to attempt finally to dispose of it. But from a botanical point of view there is little difficulty.

In the plant-materials of textiles there is a sharp contrast between the West and the East. In the former from prehistoric times the stems of plants yielded bast-fibres which were extracted by maceration; such were flax and hemp of which only the former was available for a fine fabric. Muslins and cotton-cloths were even finer and found their way from India; for these the material was the long hairs which clothe the seeds of the cotton plant. Silken tissues woven from the unwound thread of the cocoon of a moth came by the same trade route but from farther China. The silk-worm itself did not reach Europe till the time of Justinian. But the cocoon of a large moth in the island of Cos supplied a substitute.

Pausanias states, 6. 26. 6, that at Elis, τὴν μὲν δὴ κανναβίδα καὶ λίνον καὶ τὴν βύσσον σπείρουσιν; he clearly distinguishes βύσσος and λίνον. In 5. 5. 2 he gives further particulars of

βύσσος; ἐνταῦθα μόνον, ἑτέρωθι δὲ οὐδαμοῦ τῆς Ἑλλάδος φύεται, and λεπτότητος μὲν ἕνεκα οὐκ ἀποδεῖ τῆς Ἐβραίων, ἔστι δὲ οὐχ ὁμοίως ξανθή.

βύσσος is a loan-word from Semitic, būṣ, but its philology does not help as to its precise meaning (*Encycl. Bibl.* 2800). It is however pretty clear that it was applied generally to any fine textile material including silk. σινδὼν βυσσίνη Hdt. 2. 86, mummy cloth, was as a fact made of linen. It is true that Pliny, *N. H.* 19. 14, describes the existence of a cotton plant in Upper Egypt and says 'vestes inde sacerdotibus Ægypti gratissimæ'; but the statement is destitute of archæological probability or confirmation. The Greeks knew of the cotton-plant in India and Arabia ἐξ οὗ τὰς σινδόνας ὑφαίνουσι (Theophr. *H. P.* 4. 7. 8). Joret (*Les Plantes dans l'Antiquité*, ii. 354) is probably right in seeing in σινδόνος βυσσίνης τελαμῶσι, Hdt. 7. 181, the use of muslin or cotton-cloth by the Persians.

The Flax plant as we have it, *Linum usitatissimum*, is an annual plant, apparently of West Asiatic origin and only known elsewhere in the cultivated state. De Candolle traces its home to the area South of the Caucasus (*Géogr. Bot.* 835) whence it was carried West to Syria and Egypt and East to India. The Hebrews and Egyptians had the practical monopoly of the manufacture of linen, while the natives of India only grew flax as an oil-seed.

But Europe had its own indigenous flax, a perennial species, *Linum angustifolium*, and in the prehistoric age this supplied a textile material. It finds its Eastern limit in Syria and it seems reasonable to suppose that it was used by the Hebrews till displaced by the more robust and more readily cultivated Caucasian plant.

The use of the prehistoric perennial flax lingers in Siberia (*Kew Bulletin*, 1890, 106). According to Halácsy it still grows at Elis. It may be identified with some certainty as the βύσσος of Pausanias; its cultivation and use would be an archaic survival. It is to be noticed that Pausanias uses βύσσος both of the plant and of its product and contrasts the latter with the βύσσος Ἐβραίων which of course was

ordinary 'flax' the product of *λίνον*. Pliny (*N. H.* 19. 20) adds another particular:—quaternis denariis scripula ejus [sc. byssini lini] permutata quondam ut auri reperio. This is paralleled by the fact that Siberian flax as sold in Petrograd is 'more expensive'; in either case the explanation is probably that the preparation is more laborious. It is further to be noticed that the Siberian product is distinguished 'by its whiteness and softness' which again fits in with the account of Pausanias.

Liddell and Scott state that *βύσσος* was 'also used of *silk*, which was supposed to be a kind of cotton, *τὰ Σηρικὰ ἔκ τινων φλοιῶν ξαινομένης βύσσου*, Strabo 693.' But this cannot be sustained; what Strabo means is that silk was combed from some bark, in other words that like flax it was technically a bast-fibre. But Pausanias knew better; *τὰς ἐσθῆτας ποιοῦσιν οἱ Σῆρες, ἀπὸ οὐδενὸς φλοιοῦ*. Taking the passage as a whole, the implication is that though *βύσσος* was a bast-fibre, silk was not.

13. *κερασκόμη*, Pseud. Diosc. 3. 52.

Liddell and Scott cite this as a name for the parsnip; they were doubtless misled by the Latin pastinaca. But the word itself is a scribal invention. This would only be a lexicographical matter were it not that some other points of interest are involved.

The passage may be quoted:—*σταφυλῖνος ἄγριος, οἱ δὲ κέρας* [*οἱ δὲ κέρας κόμην καλοῦσιν*] *Ῥωμαῖοι καρώταμ, οἱ δὲ παστινάκα ῥούστικα* (Wellmann's recension). The last synonym is confirmed by Pliny *N. H.* 25. 112, simile staphylino, quod pastinacam erraticam appellant, and by Columella, 9. 4, agrestis pastinaca et ejusdem nominis edomita quam Græci *σταφυλῖνον* vocant. *Σταφυλῖνος* was the Carrot, *Daucus Carota*, which the Romans called pastinaca.

So useful an esculent would not escape a vulgar name and *κέρας* is appropriate enough. Appuleius has ceras = pastinaca. *κέρας κόμη* is explained by Salmasius, 704 c, as originating in *κόμη* being a gloss on *κέρας* 'additum a Græculo,' and after-

wards incorporated in the text; Wellmann accepts this. The only authority for the equation *κέρας* = *κόμη* which is not found in modern lexicons is Il. 11. 385, *κέρα ἀγλαέ*. Salmasius supports a similar sense of cornu by Juv. 13, 165, madido torquentem cornua cirro. Whether sustainable or not is immaterial for the present purpose; it is sufficient that such a view was held by the ancient commentators. Cowper rendered *κέρα ἀγλαέ* by 'man of curls' as an appellation of contempt.

Κερασκόμιον is also given by Liddell and Scott as a synonym of *οἰνάνθη*, Ps. Diosc. 3. 120. This was primarily the inflorescence of the wild vine, *Vitis silvestris*, Diosc. 5. 4, used for the *ἔλαιον οἰνάνθινον* in Cyprus. In Diosc. 3. 120 it is our dropwort, *Spiræa Filipendula*, the flowers of which had a similar odour, 'odor idem...inde nomen,' Plin. *N. H.* 21. 65. But *κερασκόμιον* is merely a f. l. in Sprengel, Diosc. vol. 1. 468, for *κερασκόμην* which Wellmann again rejects for *κέρας*. The root however does not justify the name, for it has *κεφαλὰς πλείονας στρογγύλας*, many round tubers. But it has *φύλλα ὥσπερ σταφυλῖνος* and it may be conjectured that *κέρας* was a gloss on this.

Apicius gives Carota, whence we derive carrot, as a synonym of pastinaca. But this must be a loan-word from Greek *καρωτόν* which is now restored in Ath. 371 E from Diphilus, *μέγας καὶ εὐαυξὴς σταφυλῖνος*; Casaubon read *κάρτον*, but this was tonsile porrum, the cropped leaves of the leek. The New English Dictionary suggests a derivation from *κάρᾱ*, but this is unconvincing. One would like if it were possible to find one from Attic *κέρας*, *κέρᾱτος*. But it is probably allied to *καρώ*, the caraway, which yielded in cultivation a root *ἐδώδιμος ὥσπερ σταφυλῖνος*, Diosc. 3. 57. It may be noted that Galen, *Alim.* 2. 67, remarks *εὐχυμότερός γε μήν ἐστιν ἡ κάρους* [sc. *ῥίζα*] *τοῦ σταφυλίνου*.

14. *βίβλος*, Theophr. 4. 8. 4.

The manufacture of writing material from the papyrus-plant is now thoroughly understood. But this was not the case till recently and the statements about it, those of Hehn

for example, showed a complete misapprehension of the botanical facts. From that point of view it may be useful to examine some of the passages relating to papyrus.

We may begin with Theophrastus who within the limits of his knowledge is always exact. He tells us, *H. P.* 4. 8. 4, *αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ πάπυρος πρὸς πλεῖστα χρήσιμος· καὶ γὰρ πλοῖα ποιοῦσιν ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῆς βίβλου ἱστία τε πλέκουσι καὶ ψιάθους καὶ ἐσθῆτά τινα καὶ στρωμνὰς καὶ σχοινία τε καὶ ἕτερα πλείω.* This is translated by Pliny, *N. H.* 13. 72, ex ipso quidem papyro navigia texunt et e libro vela tegetesque, necnon et vestem, etiam stragula ac funes. This gives us the equation *βίβλος* = liber.

The papyrus-plant, *Cyperus Papyrus*, is a gigantic sedge[1] with stems triangular in section; these consist of pith surrounded by a thin, rather brittle, weakly fibrous and inseparable rind or cortex, the *βίβλος*. This remained as a waste-product when the pith had been cut into thin strips which when glued together and dried formed the writing material.

But besides the rind the slender tops of the stems were also useless for making papyrus. Pliny, *N. H.* 13. 76, has a rather obscure statement, post hanc papyrum est extremumque ejus scirpo simile, ac ne funibus quidem nisi in umore utile, the meaning of which has been differently construed. But extremum is fixed by scirpo simile, rush-like. We may conclude therefore that the slender tops were used for making rough hawsers which only preserved their tenacity if kept in water: it is obvious that they could not be used for rigging. This perhaps throws light on a passage in Theophrastus, *H. P.* 4. 8. 4. He says that the Papyrus *γίνεται καὶ ἐν Συρίᾳ*; it must have been introduced there early and still grows in the Jordan valley. He adds *ὅθεν καὶ Ἀντίγονος εἰς τὰς ναῦς ἐποιεῖτο τὰ σχοινία.*

It is well known that the *πλοῖα* were simply rafts of papyrus stems tied together; thus Lucan, 4. 136, conseritur bibula Memphitis cymba papyro. It is physically impossible that anything but the rind could have been used for the other purposes except the *σχοινία*. It could be split into strips of

[1] In Smith's Dictionary of Antiquities it is called 'the papyrus-tree'!

varying size and woven into a rough fabric or a coarse matting. The fabric, and not as Macleane seems to think an inferior writing material, supplied clothing to the Egyptian peasant; succinctus patria...papyro, Juv. 4. 24. The matting was used for sails, *ἱστίοισι βυβλίνοισι* Hdt. 2. 96, which shows that *βίβλος* and *βύβλος* are the same word. But they were only available for light river craft; the navium armamenta of sea-going ships were made of flax (Plin. *N. H.* 19. 25) and Hermippus describes Egypt as supplying the world.

The economic argument is equally strong. The papyrus-plant was brought from Nubia to Egypt where the primary purpose of its cultivation was the production of writing material; when its cultivation ceased it disappeared. Wilkinson remarks (*Anc. Egypt.* 2. 121) that, except of course incidentally, "it cannot have been employed for so many purposes, the cultivation being limited and a government monopoly."

Pliny tells us (*N. H.* 13. 69) in palmarum foliis primo scriptitatum, dein quarundum arborum libris. It seems incontestable that whether in Greek, *βίβλος*, or in Latin, liber, 'bark' passed into 'book.' *βύβλων ἐργαστικαί*, Plat. *Polit.* 288 E, refers, as Liddell and Scott are no doubt right in stating, to 'bark' and not to papyrus which was not a Greek industry.

ὅπλον βύβλινον, *Od.* 21. 390, must be considered. It may be inferred from Pliny that Papyrus rope had little tensile strength as it required to be kept wet. Eustathius probably knowing this scouts the idea that the Homeric *ὅπλον* was made from *πάπυρος*. He adds, *οἱ δὲ καννάβινον· ἕτεροι δὲ, τὸ ἐκ φιλύρας*; neither source is probable. A more likely material would be supplied by the date-palm; the sheathing bases of the leaves break up into a coarse fibre and this would be looked upon as a bark or *βίβλος*. Palms have no separable bark or *φλοιός*; when Theophrastus, *H. P.* 1. 5. 2, calls *φοῖνιξ*, *τραχύφλοιος*, he could only have in mind the persistent bases of the leaves. Arrian, *Hist. Ind.* 29, can have meant nothing else; *πλέκουσι* [*δίκτυα*] *ἐκ τοῦ φλοιοῦ τῶν φοινίκων· στρέφοντες τὸν φλοιὸν ὥσπερ λίνον*. According to Wilkinson ropes made from date-fibre have been found in Egyptian tombs, and though the date was only grown exceptionally in Greece,

the use of such rope, probably imported from Egypt, was known to the Greeks; Græcos ad funes usos...palmarum foliis (Plin. *N. H.* 19. 31). Still more incredible is the supposition that the *ὅπλα βύβλινα*, Hdt. 7. 25, with which Xerxes bridged the Hellespont could have been made from papyrus. They must have been gigantic cables which from the calculation of W. Leaf (*Troy*, 370) were a mile and a third long. It may be conjectured with some certainty that they were made of palm-fibre and obtained from Egypt.

Papyrus the name of the plant was applied by metonymy to its products, writing material and matting; conversely *βύβλος* its cortex was used for the plant *πάπυρος*. *βύβλος στεφανωτρίς* was not, as Liddell and Scott suppose, 'another plant' but merely the flowering head of the papyrus. This is clear from Pliny, *N. H.* 13. 71, thyrsi modo cacumen includens, nullo semine aut usu ejus alio quam floris ad deos coronandos.

15. *περσέα*, Theophr. *H. P.* 4. 2. 5.

Three plants, papyrus, nelumbium and persea, were foreign to Egypt. They were cultivated, played an important part in ancient Egyptian life and disappeared from the country when that life decayed. Though its fruit was edible, the main use of persea was ritualistic. For its 'Egyptology' reference may be made to De Gubernatis, *Mythologie des plantes*, 2. 284; Murr, *Die Pflanzenwelt in der Gr. Mythologie*, 74; and Woenig, *Die Pflanzen im Alten Ægypten*, 321. The last enumerates the various attempts which have been made to identify it botanically. Of these the most recent and most certain is that of Schweinfurth who has found the material of wreaths of persea from tombs to be derived from *Mimusops Schimperi*, a tree native of Abyssinia. Liddell and Scott have 'a kind of Egyptian tree with the fruit growing from the stem' which points to some confusion with the sycamore.

But although the identity of *περσέα* is now settled, the problem still remains which perplexed antiquity. It makes its first appearance in Dioscorides, 1. 129: *περσαία δένδρον ἐστὶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ...τοῦτο δὲ ἱστόρησάν τινες ἐν Περσίδι ἀναιρετικὸν εἶναι, μετατιθὲν δὲ εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀλλοιωθῆναι*

καὶ ἐδώδιμον γενέσθαι. Paulus Aegineta also has περσαία with the same statement as Dioscorides that it was an Egyptian tree the leaves of which were a remedy for hæmorrhage. But he drops the story as to its origin. This survived as late as Galen (*Alim.* 2. 36) who repeats it without comment beyond saying that he had seen the tree at Alexandria.

The problem then is to account for the myth that persea was of Persian origin and originally poisonous; certainly neither statement has any foundation in fact. The scholiast on Nicander (*Ther.* 764) gives the current belief as to its real native country which we now know to be the true one: τὴν δὲ περσείαν φασίν, ἣν ῥοδακινέαν καλοῦσιν, ἀπὸ Αἰθιοπίας εἰς Αἴγυπτον μεταφυτευθῆναι, and he then adds what apparently is the earliest version of the myth. Βῶλος δὲ ὁ Δημοκρίτειος ἐν τῷ περὶ συμπαθειῶν καὶ ἀντιπαθειῶν Πέρσας φησὶν ἔχοντας παρ' ἑαυτοῖς θανάσιμον φυτὸν φυτεῦσαι ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ ὡς πολλῶν μελλόντων ἀναιρεθήσεσθαι, τὴν δὲ ἀγαθὴν οὖσαν εἰς τοὐναντίον μεταβαλεῖν ποιῆσαί τε τὸ φυτὸν καρπὸν γλυκύτατον.

Nicander himself, *Alex.* 100–2, gives another myth about the περσεία—Περσεὺς ἦν...ῥεῖα Μυκηναίῃσιν ἐνηέξησεν ἀρούραις. But Theophrastus only speaks of it as ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ and there is no evidence that it ever crossed the Mediterranean, or that any Greek or Roman had ever seen the tree unless in Egypt. We learn from Theophrastus, *C. P.* 2. 3. 7, that an attempt had been made to introduce it into the island of Rhodes but it failed as it became sterile; ἄκαρπα δὲ γίνεται καθάπερ ἡ περσέα ἡ αἰγυπτία περὶ Ῥόδον. Murr, *l.c.* p. 75, suggests probably enough that Nicander has confused Mycene with Memphis.

The Persea produces a plum-like fruit though its botanical affinity is widely remote from that of any plum. The scholiast was evidently quite ignorant of what περσέα really was and thought it was the peach which is what he meant by ῥοδακινέα.

But the peach did not come from Ethiopia and only towards the Christian era found its way westward through Persia from China. It was called (as well as the Citron) περσικὸν μῆλον and, as persica in Latin, promptly became confounded with

persea. The supposed original poisonous properties of the latter were transferred to the peach. Thus, Columella, 10. 405 et seq.

> pomis, quæ barbara Persis
> miserat, ut fama est, patriis armata venenis,
> ac nunc expositi parvo discrimine lethi
> ambrosios praebent succos, oblita nocendi.
> quin etiam ejusdem gentis de nomine dicta
> exiguo properant mitescere Persica malo.

Daubeny, who was more chemist than botanist, enquires (*Rom. Husbandry*, 258) 'could this mistake arise from a knowledge of the poisonous properties of the prussic acid existing in the kernels of the peach?' A serious answer is scarcely needful. Pliny (*N. H.* 15. 45) explodes the story: falsum est [persica] venenata cum cruciatu in Persis gigni et pœnarum causa ab regibus translata in Ægyptum terra mitigata. id enim de Persea diligentiores tradunt, quæ in totum alia est... nec extra orientem nasci voluit. And he proceeds to give us some interesting information (*l.c.* 46): eam quoque eruditiores negaverunt ex Perside propter supplicia translatam, sed a Perseo Memphi satam, et ob id Alexandrum illa coronari victores ibi instituisse in honorem atavi sui.

The poets kept the myth of Perseus; thus Callimachus quoted by the scholiast on Nicander, *Alex.* 101: *καὶ τριτάτη Περσῆος ἐπώνυμος, ἥς ὀρόδαμνον | Αἰγύπτῳ κατέπηξεν*; this gives the traditional etymology. But the 'eruditiores' abandoned the myth. Diodorus Siculus, 1. 34, gives a more prosaic story: *καὶ τούτων αἱ μὲν ὀνομαζόμεναι περσαῖαι καρπὸν διάφορον ἔχουσι τῇ γλυκύτητι, μετενεχθέντος ἐξ Αἰθιοπίας ὑπὸ Περσῶν τοῦ φυτοῦ καθ' ὃν καιρὸν Καμβύσης ἐκρατησεν ἐκείνων τῶν τόπων.* This may well be historical though there appears to be some evidence that remains of persea have been found in Egyptian tombs of a far earlier date. But if the Persians brought it to Egypt the belief would easily arise that it was a native of Persia. They are credited with the introduction of Nelumbium into Egypt; it is an Asiatic plant nowhere native of Africa (cf. Woenig, *l.c.* 45).

It may be concluded that persea really meant the Persian

tree. For Theophrastus in stating that it was sterile in the island of Rhodes calls it *περσέα* in *C. P.* 2. 3. 7 and *τὸ πέρσιον* in *H. P.* 2. 2. 10. Pliny reproduces both as persica arbor (*N. H.* 15. 45; 16. 111).

Three passages in Athenæus relate to *πέρσεα* and deal with matters of fact and not with myth. They have been much discussed and require examination. As long as the identity of *περσέα* was only conjectural its result could only be uncertain.

Posidonius who lived in the 1st century B.C. states, Ath. 649 D, *φέρει δὲ καὶ τὸ πέρσειον ἡ Ἀραβία καὶ ἡ Συρία καὶ τὸ καλούμενον βιστάκιον.* Joret (*Les Plantes dans l'Antiquité*, 2. 76) first corrected *πέρσειον* to *περσικόν* but abandoned this at the suggestion of Schweinfurth who amended the passage by omitting the last *καί*. Joret then translates it:—'l'Arabie produit aussi le *πέρσειον* (persea) et la Syrie le soi-disant *βιστάκιον* (pistachier).' This is in agreement with the botanical facts. For Schweinfurth in 1891 had announced the discovery of *Mimusops Schimperi* in Southern Arabia and had used it in support of a supposed racial migration from that country into the Nile Valley (cf. Elliot Smith, *The Ancient Egyptians*, 35). But as the tree is undoubtedly native in Abyssinia this does not carry much weight; the Flora of Western Arabia is essentially African. But the existence of *περσέα* in South Arabia emphasizes the fact that it was semi-tropical: it reached its climatic limit at Memphis and failed to establish itself spontaneously when its culture was abandoned.

Athenæus 649 A also cites from Κλέαρχος ὁ Σολεύς a list of *τραγήματα* which includes according to the early texts *περσία, μηλέα.* Casaubon printed the passage as prose, but Salmasius, 427 E, apparently discovered that it was in verse and remarks with his usual vigour: 'male legitur *περσία*, quod versus respuit'; he then restores the line:—

Ἰσχὰς, ἄπιος, πέρσεια, μῆλ', ἀμύγδαλα

which Kaibel adopts. Salmasius adds, 'ubi *τὰ πέρσεια* sunt mala Persica.' He discusses the whole persea problem at

enormous length (pp. 427—429) but he is mostly 'bombinans in vacuo' for want of a botanical standpoint. I must confess to some uncertainty as to his conclusion but suppose him to mean that Clearchus intended the peach. He thinks that this was 'temporibus Theophrasti passim in Græcia' though he admits there is not a particle of evidence to support it.

Liddell and Scott cite *πέρσειον* from Clearchus as the fruit of *περσέα*. But this cannot be sustained. If the tree failed in cultivation in Rhodes, it would not succeed in Cilicia. And it is in the highest degree improbable that the fruit was imported from Egypt. Further Clearchus is said to have been a pupil of Aristotle and therefore was a contemporary of Theophrastus who could not be ignorant of the use of persea-fruit by the Greeks as a *τράγημα* if it were a fact. A simple solution is to suppose that Clearchus intended the Citron, the *τὸ μῆλον τὸ μηδικὸν ἢ τὸ περσικόν* of Theophrastus, *H. P.* 4. 4. 2. Like all its tribe the Citron travels well and we know from Antiphanes (Ath. 84 B), who speaks of it as an *ὄψον*, that it was brought overland from Persia to Greece:—

> *νεωστὶ γὰρ τὸ σπέρμα τοῦτ' ἀφιγμένον*
> *εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐστὶ παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως.*

I venture to take the words *πέρσεια μῆλα* together: for *μηλέα*, the apple, is a native of Pontus and I know of no evidence of its growing in Cilicia.

The last reference to persea in Athenæus (198 B) is not of much importance or of interest except for the ingenious deduction which Murr has drawn from it. A procession organized by Antiochus Epiphanes contained a female performer who is thus described:—*φέρουσα τῇ μὲν μιᾷ τῶν χειρῶν στέφανον περσαίας, τῇ δὲ ἑτέρᾳ ῥάβδον φοίνικος· ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ αὕτη Πεντετηρίς*. Murr's comment (*l.c.* 75) is, 'dass die Früchte des Baumes fünfkantig sind, wodurch es erklärlich wird.' But he has got hold of a long discarded identification and his ingenuity is on the wrong track. The personification was of a quinquennium or lustrum. The palm was reminiscent of the Delia held every five years, and the persea of the crown founded by Alexander at Memphis.

If as seems probable persea was sometimes called, though erroneously, *τὸ πέρσιον* [*φυτόν*] it might easily be confused with another *πέρσιον* which was *θανάσιμον*, especially if both were imperfectly known. Sprengel (*Diosc.* vol. 2. 424) long ago suggested that this was the case. Dioscorides in fact gives us (4. 73) *στρύχνον μανικόν, δ' ἔνιοι πέρσειον* (*πέρσιον* in some MSS.); he borrows his description from the *μανικός* of Theophrastus, *H. P.* 9. 11. 6. But Sprengel failed in a convincing identification of the plant. This De Candolle (*Géogr. Bot. Rais.* 2. 731) points out had been effected by Fabius Columna as long ago as 1592 (*Φυτοβάσανος*, 46); it is the thorn-apple, *Datura Stramonium.* But De Candolle missed the light it threw on the persea-problem.

The thorn-apple is a native of the countries bordering the Caspian whence it has spread eastward to India and westward to Europe. In India it is the commonest poison for criminal purposes. In moderate doses it is a narcotic. It may be conjectured that Nicander's *ἦν πέρσειον ἔπουσιν* (*Alex.* 429) which was apparently an ingredient in a sedative application was thorn-apple, though the scholiast has nothing to say about it.

The upshot is that there were two plants which probably enough the Persians had a hand in bringing to Egypt: the *πέρσιον θανάσιμον* and the *πέρσιον ἐδώδιμον.* Popular usage thought that identity in name implied an actual one. It is a common pitfall in Greek botany. Cedar and Citron in a reverse way got the same name from a common use.

A story told by Galen, 11. 681, lends some support to the identification of *πέρσιον* with thorn-apple. He examined a plant, *ὃν ἑκατόνταρχός τις ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Αἴγυπτον βαρβάρου χώρας ἐκόμισεν. οὕτως δ' ἦν βαρὺς καὶ ἀηδὴς τὴν ὀσμὴν ὡς μηδὲ γεύεσθαι τολμᾶν, ἀλλ' εἰκάζειν θανάσιμον ὑπάρχειν.* It has never been identified, but could only be *Hyoscyamus muticus*, a Solanaceous plant nearly related to the thorn-apple. Campbell Thompson met with it in the Sinatic Desert, *Pilgrim's Scrip*, 165, and states that it was known to the Babylonians as producing madness. Schweinfurth gives tatoûrah as its Arabic name and datoûrah as that of thorn-apple. Galen

says *ὄνομα τῆς βοτάνης...λυκοπέρσιον ἔφασκεν εἶναι*. Both Greeks and Arabs had therefore a common name for the two plants; the prefix *λυκο-* is probably intensive.

16. *ἀφάρκη*, Theophr. *H. P.* 1. 9. 3.

This is the name of a native Greek tree which occurs six times in Theophrastus and is quoted once by Pliny as apharce, *N. H.* 13. 121. Beyond this we have nothing. Its identity has never been ascertained. It invites an attempt.

In *H. P.* 1. 9. 3 it is grouped with *κόμαρος* and *ἀνδράχλη*; all three occurred wild, *ἀγρία*, and were evergreen, *ἀείφυλλα*. As to the two former there can be no doubt; *κόμαρος* was *Arbutus Unedo*, the Strawberry-tree, and its fruit was *μιμαίκυλον*; *ἀνδράχλη* was *Arbutus Andrachne*. Both *ἀνδράχλη* and *ἀφάρκη* were *ὀρεινά*, *H. P.* 3. 3. 1, and so as a matter of fact is *κόμαρος*.

Theophrastus was himself evidently a little perplexed about *ἀφάρκη*. He says that it and *ἀνδράχλη* put out fresh leaves simultaneously, *H. P.* 3. 4. 2. While *κόμαρος* produced good charcoal, *ἀφάρκη* was used *εἰς τὸ καίειν*. The crucial fact about it is that it was *δίκαρπος*, *H. P.* 3. 4. 4, that is, that it shared the almost unique peculiarity of the Strawberry-tree and carried the fruit of one year while flowering in the next. This fixes it as an *Arbutus*. But there are only two species in Greece and they are both provided with names. The difficulty would be insoluble but for the closer knowledge we now possess of the Greek flora. The two species cross readily in our nurseries and the hybrid is found to occur on the Greek mountains. It has distinctive characters from either parent and we may therefore safely conclude that *ἀφάρκη* was *Arbutus hybrida*.

17. *τὸ τοῦ βολβοῦ κώδυον*, Theophr. *H. P.* 6. 8. 1.

Theophrastus in describing the flowering time of various conspicuous plants adds after the anemone, *καὶ τὸ τοῦ βολβοῦ κώδυον· ἐμπλέκουσι γὰρ ἔνιοι καὶ τοῦτο εἰς τοὺς στεφάνους*. What he meant has never been clearly ascertained and the difficulty is not diminished by Pliny's version of the passage

(*N. H.* 21. 64) 'anemone; est autem haec silvestrium bulborum flos.' It is true that an anemone springs from a tuberous root which would be a *βολβός*; but this was also *κατ' ἐξοχήν* the name of a frequent Greek plant, a Grape-hyacinth, *Muscari comosum* the bulb of which was, and still is, a common article of food; *βολβοὺς ἄρα ζητοῦσι*, Ar. *Nub.* 188. Pliny was misled by the ambiguity into identifying it with anemone.

One attempt of the early editors was to write *τὸ βολβουκώδιον* which was treated as an unknown plant name; as *Bulbocodium* it has been identified with a plant which does not grow in Greece. Another was to identify it with codiaminon, Pl. *N. H.* 21. 64, but this is f. l. for cyclaminum. Schneider simply translates 'bulbi capitulum' which is meaningless. These were the counsels of despair. Yet the solution as often happens lies on the surface and for that reason has been overlooked.

κώδυον only occurs in this passage apparently. But *κωδύα* which is supposed to be a variant is used several times by Theophrastus and others. In *H. P.* 4. 8. 7 it is the seed-vessel (or *κιβώριον*) of *Nelumbium*; in 4. 8. 10 and 11 of *Nymphœa*; in 9. 12. 4 of a poppy. Aristophanes who like Martial contains a good deal of popular botany has, *Fr.* 166, *κωδία* in the same sense. The general meaning would be 'head' which does not give much help, except that *κώδεια*, *κωδία* and *κωδύα* all appear to be the same word.

We get a clue from another source. Gaza was a fifteenth century Greek who first translated Theophrastus into Latin. It is interesting to see how the passage struck a Greek, especially one who might have some traditional knowledge of its meaning. He translates the words in Theophrastus 'ad hoc bulbi flos.' We may render this 'the inflorescence of *Muscari comosum*.' It was necessary to specify this because to a Greek *βολβός* would only mean an edible root which would not be suitable for a chaplet and Theophrastus always aims at precise statement.

The inflorescence is almost unique and difficult to describe without an illustration to anyone who is not familiar with the plant in some old-fashioned garden; a stem bears small and

inconspicuous flowers but terminates in a fluffy mass of brightly coloured filamentous abortive ones, hence the specific name *comosum*. The difficulty now arises that this bears no resemblance to a 'poppy-head,' *κωδύα*. But the earlier editions of Theophrastus as of Athenæus who, 680 E, quotes the passage, have *κώδιον*, a diminutive which means a 'fleece.' And although Stephanus, 5518 B, says that here 'non possum non suspectum habere' it is perhaps not unduly straining the meaning to suppose that Theophrastus had in mind a 'tuft of wool.' This would not be far from the old popular English name for the plant, 'purple tassel.'

18. *σησάμινα ξύλα*, Diosc. 1. 98.

Dioscorides in describing Ebony (*ἔβενος*) tells us:—*ἔνιοι δὲ τὰ ἀκάνθινα ἢ καὶ σησάμινα καλούμενα ξύλα, ἐμφερῆ ὄντα, ἀντὶ ἐβένου πωλοῦσι*. This is the text of most of the MSS. But on the authority of one, and that late, Sprengel corrects *σησάμινα* to *συκάμινα* and he is followed by Wellmann who is rarely at fault. It may be premised that *ἀκάνθικον ξυλον* is the product of *ἄκανθα αἰγυπτία*, Shittah wood (*Acacia arabica*), *συκάμινον ξύλον* of the Sycamore (*Ficus Sycomorus*). It is quite true that these two trees were the only native sources of timber in Egypt (cf. Woenig, *Die Pflanzen im Alten Ägypten*, p. 282). But Dioscorides is speaking of substitutes for ebony; Shittah wood is dark-coloured and heavy and would serve, sycamore wood on the other hand has no quality in any way comparable. The correction therefore robs the statement of Dioscorides of any intelligible meaning. Why then was it made? It was because apart from this passage *σησάμινος* has a not uncommon and quite incompatible meaning. It is the adjective of *σησαμῆ*, sesame, the most important oil-plant of India (*Sesamum indicum*) and a herb but not a tree. It may be noted that *σησαμῆ* is a loan word, hellenized from Arabic semsem.

But *σησάμινος* occurs again associated with ebony in the *Periplus M. R.* 36 and *σησάμινα ξύλα* is quoted from Cosmas. In the former case Fabricius following Sprengel corrects *φαλάγ-*

γων σησαμίνων to φαλάγγων συκαμίνων. But this is frankly impossible. The Sycamore is confined to North Africa and its wood could not be an article of Indian export as ebony was.

The problem was solved by McCrindle (cf. Schoff, *Periplus*, p. 152). The wood was that of an Indian tree, the Sissoo or Shisham (*Dalbergia Sissoo*); it was exported from India in the remotest antiquity as it has been found in the ruins of Babylonian buildings. In this case σησάμινος traces back through Arabic sāsim to Hindi sīsū. It is the result of a double process of hellenization and assimilation in both of which the Greeks were adepts.

When once a truth gets side-tracked it is apt to meet with fresh disaster. Joret (*Les Plantes dans l'Antiquité*, vol. ii, p. 369) seeing that the correction of Fabricius was untenable, corrects in turn συκαμίνων to σακαμίνων, a non-existent Greek word which he constructs from sāka the Sanscrit name of Teak. But as Yule (*Hobson-Jobson*, 692) shows conclusively teak is already mentioned in the same passage of the *Periplus* as σαγαλίνα ξύλα. It may be noted that teak was the ξύλον ἐν Τύλῳ...ἐξ οὗ τὰ πλοῖα ναυπηγοῦνται, mentioned by Theophrastus (*H. P.* 5. 4. 7).

Incidentally it is now possible to clear up another passage which has hitherto remained obscure. Theophrastus, after discussing ebony, proceeds (*H. P.* 5. 3. 2):—εἶναι δὲ καὶ ἄλλο τι δένδρον ὃ ἅμα τῇ μελανίᾳ καὶ ποικιλίαν τινὰ ἔχει ὑπέρυθρον ὥστε εἶναι τὴν ὄψιν ὡσὰν ἐβένου ποικίλης· ποιεῖσθαι δ' ἐξ αὐτοῦ καὶ κλίνας καὶ δίφρους καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ σπουδαζόμενα. τὸ δένδρον μέγα σφόδρα καὶ καλόφυλλον εἶναι ὅμοιον ταῖς ἀπίοις. There can be no doubt that Theophrastus describes the Sissoo with his usual precision. The tree attains a large size and is valued for its shade; the leaflets agree in size and shape with the leaves of the pear. The wood is dark brown with darker veins, and it has always been esteemed for furniture and carving.

W. T. THISELTON-DYER.

THE "BUGONIA" MYTH[1].

In Mr Royds' little book on *The Beasts, Birds and Bees of Virgil*[2]—which would be altogether charming if only it had an index—the author makes a short reference to the disclosure by Vergil in the Fourth Georgic of the "memorable discovery of the great Arcadian keeper[3]," and the way in which "oft ere now, from the slaughter of bullocks, tainted gore has generated bees[3]." For the benefit of any beekeeper whose stock may entirely die out and who may be at a loss how to renew it, Vergil undertakes to expound the legend fully, tracing it to its original source. In Egypt, he says, men have unbounded faith in it. He describes the process as follows:—

> "exiguus primum atque ipsos contractus ad usus,
> eligitur locus; hunc angustique imbrice tecti
> parietibusque premunt artis, et quattuor addunt,
> quattuor a ventis, obliqua luce fenestras.
> tum vitulus bima curvans iam cornua fronte
> quaeritur; huic geminae nares et spiritus oris
> multa reluctanti obstruitur, plagisque perempto
> tunsa per integram solventur viscera pellem.

[1] Osten Sacken's exhaustive treatise on the Bugonia myth is to be found in the xxvth annual volume of the *Bullettino della Società Entomologica Italiana*, Firenze, 1893, a journal very hard to come by in this country. I am indebted to it for many references, and to Mr H. Rackham, Classical Tutor, to Mr A. Rogers, of the University Library, and to Mr J. T. Yarde, all of Christ's College, for much needed help with the quotations. [There is also an English treatise by Osten Sacken "On the Oxen-born bees of the Ancients," Heidelberg, 1894, an enlarged edition of the Italian article. A copy is in the library of the Zoological Society. J. A. P.]

[2] Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1914.

[3] Verg. *Georg.* IV. 281 foll. See also *Miscellaneous Writings of John Conington*, Vol. II. London, Longmans, Green & Co. 1872.

sic positum in clauso linquunt, et ramea costis
subiciunt fragmenta, thymum, casiasque recentis.
hoc geritur Zephyris primum impellentibus undas,
ante novis rubeant quam prata coloribus, ante
garrula quam tignis nidum suspendat hirundo.
interea teneris tepefactus in ossibus umor
aestuat, et visenda modis animalia miris,
trunca pedum primo, mox et stridentia pinnis,
miscentur, tenuemque magis magis aera carpunt,
donec, ut aestivis effusus nubibus imber,
erupere, aut ut nervo pulsante sagittae,
prima leves ineunt si quando proelia Parthi."

The poet then turns to the origin of the process, and tells how it was first discovered by Aristaeus, the son of Apollo and the nymph Cyrene. The first production of bees by this method is briefly described at the end of the poem.

The legend of the ox-born bees, by some expanded to explain Samson's well-known riddle[1], was carefully investigated towards the close of the last century by C. R. Osten Sacken. He has shown that it prevailed around the Mediterranean, throughout Northern Africa, and in some parts of Asia, and even as late as the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries was accepted without query. "Melanchthon considered it as a divine provision," the great naturalist Aldrovandus (1522–1605) accepted it without contradiction, the English naturalist Moufet (1634) spoke of it as a common occurrence and Bochart (1663) admitted it as an undoubted fact. Sacken designates it by the convenient term which appears as the title of this paper, and which was the name of a poem by the Alexandrian Eumelus[2], who was possibly the authority followed by Vergil. It was a very widely spread legend throughout classical times and indeed it lasted until well on in the sixteenth century.

We will first deal with Samson. Now it might very well happen that the dead body of an ox—or as a matter of fact of

[1] Judges xiv. 14.

[2] Eusebius, *Chronicon* 250, see Conington on *Georgic* iv. 317. Vergil may also have used the poems on Bee-keeping by Aratus and Nicander.

a lion—lying on the sun-parched sands of Palestine or of Egypt would form a convenient hollow in which bees would gladly establish a hive. The bodies of animals do not always decay, often they dry up. And this most frequently happens in deserts and dry regions. Recently in the Lodge of this College we found, under the floor of one of the apartments of the Foundress, Lady Margaret—mother of Henry VII—later the drawing-room, the mummies of four rats, rats of the old *Mus rattus* or black-rat species, now practically extinct in England: and judging from the literature with which they had lined their death-beds they must have perished early in the sixteenth century. They may indeed have died of plague, for England in the first half of the sixteenth century was seldom free from plague, as the Venetian Ambassadors, Erasmus, and others have recorded. The bodies of the rats were in no way decayed: they had simply dried, and had retained so well their outward shape that it was easy to recognise those specific characters which distinguish them from their successor, the *Mus decumanus*, the brown, Hanoverian or Norwegian rat.

The effort to connect the story of Samson with the classical myth of Bugonia, in my opinion, breaks down[1]. It has been said that bees being cleanly insects would not build in a dead body, and yet the normal hives of the inhabitants of Palestine are plastered with cow-dung, and we have it on the evidence of J. G. Wood[2] that bees still build their hives in the carcases of desiccated camels. The really important thing in Samson's story is the honey. The later writers about Bugonia never mention honey or the comb or even the hive. And after all what did the Greek and Roman writers know of Samson? We are told that Samson killed a lion and after a while "he turned aside to see the carcase of the lion and behold there was a swarm of bees in the body of the lion, and honey; and he took it into his hands and went on eating[3]." If we believe in this honey (and why should we doubt it?), we must remove

[1] The view here put forward is supported by the best commentators on the Book of Judges. (Cf. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges*, by Dr G. F. Moore.)

[2] *Bible Animals*, p. 608 (cited by Royds, p. 95).

[3] Judges xiv. 8, 9.

Samson's riddle from the circle of the Bugonia legends, where Osten Sacken has placed it.

But the fact that from time to time a bee-hive might occasionally be found in the mummified carcase of an animal is hardly sufficient to explain so widely spread and long-enduring a myth. Neither does it correspond with the description given by Vergil and many other authors of what they conceived to happen.

Vergil's account quoted above corresponds fairly closely with the version given in the *Geoponica*, which is as follows:—

Ἰόβας δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς Λιβύων ἐν λάρνακι ξυλίνῃ φησὶ δεῖν ποιεῖσθαι μελίσσας· καὶ Δημόκριτος καὶ Βάρων, ἐν Ῥωμαίᾳ γλώσσῃ, ἐν οἴκῳ φασὶ χρὴ ποιεῖσθαι, ὅπερ ἐστὶ καὶ ἄμεινον. ὁ δὲ τρόπος οὗτος. οἰκός σοι ἔστω ὑψηλὸς δεκαπηχυαῖος, καὶ εὖρος πηχῶν ι', καὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς πλευραῖς ἴσος. εἴσοδος δὲ εἰς αὐτὸν περιποιείσθω μία, καὶ θυρίδες τέσσαρες, ἐν ἑκάστῳ τοίχῳ μία. εἰς τοῦτον ἀγαγὼν βοῦν τριακοντάμηνον, εὔσαρκον, λιπαρὸν μάλιστα, περίστησον αὐτῷ νεανίας πολλοὺς καὶ τυπτέτωσαν αὐτὸν ἰσχυρῶς, καὶ τύπτοντες αὐτὸν ῥοπάλοις ἀποκτεινάτωσαν ὁμοῦ ταῖς σαρξὶ τὰ ὀστέα συναλοῦντες· φυλακὴν δὲ ἐχέτωσαν τὸ μὴ αἱμάξαι τι τοῦ βοός (οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐξ αἵματος κυηθείη ἡ μέλισσα), ταῖς δε πρώταις πληγαῖς μὴ βιαίως ἐμπεσόντες. εὐθὺς δὲ ἀποπεφράχθω πᾶς τοῦ βοὸς πόρος ὀθόναις καθαραῖς καὶ λεπταῖς πίσσῃ κεχρισμέναις· οἷον ὄμματα καὶ ῥῖνες καὶ στόμα, καὶ ὅσα τῇ φύσει πεποίηται εἰς κένωσιν ἀναγκαίαν. ἔπειτα θύμον ὑποστρώσαντες πολύν, καὶ ὕπτιον ἐπ' αὐτοῦ καταθέντες τὸν βοῦν, ἐξελθόντες τοῦ οἴκου εὐθὺς τὴν θύραν καὶ τὰς θυρίδας ἐπιχρισάτωσαν πηλῷ στεγανῷ, ὡς μήτε ἀέρι μήτε ἀνέμῳ μηδ' ἡντινοῦν εἴσδυσιν ἢ διάπνευσιν εἶναι. τρίτῃ δὲ ἑβδομάδι χρὴ πάντοθεν ἐξανοίξαντα εἰσεᾶσαι φῶς τε καὶ ἀέρα καθαρόν, πλὴν ὁπόθεν ἂν καθίῃ σφοδρὸν πνεῦμα· εἰ γὰρ ὧδε ἔχοι, τὴν κατὰ τοῦτο εἴσοδον κεκλεισμένην χρὴ ἐᾶσαι. ἐπὰν δὲ δόξωσιν ἐψυχῶσθαι αἱ ὕλαι πνεῦμα αὐταρκὲς ἐπισπασάμεναι, αὖθις χρὴ συγκλεῖσαι τῷ πηλῷ κατὰ τὴν προτέραν χρίσιν. ἐνδεκάτῃ δὲ μετὰ ταύτην ἡμέρᾳ ἀνοίξας εὑρήσεις πλήρη μελισσῶν βοτρυδὸν ἐπ' ἀλλήλαις συνηγμένων

καὶ τοῦ βοὸς λειπόμενα τὰ κέρατα καὶ τὰ ὀστᾶ καὶ τὰς τρίχας ἄλλο δὲ μηδέν[1].

Can the Democritus of the *Geoponica* be the great man of science of the fifth century B.C.? He wrote a treatise on the *Causes of Animals*; but no mention of the birth of bees from oxen occurs in any of his extant fragments; and the absence of any reference to the belief in Aristotle's exhaustive discussion[2] of the generation of bees makes it unlikely that Democritus mentioned it. But at any rate it was accepted as a familiar scientific fact by the time of the Alexandrian poets, with whom 'ox-born' was a stock epithet for bees. For instance Antigonus Carystius, in his reference to the belief, attests this for Philetas:—

Ἴδια δὲ καὶ περὶ τὰς συγκρίσεις καὶ ἀλλοιώσεις τῶν ζῴων, ἔτι δὲ γενέσεις. οἷον ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ τὸν βοῦν ἐὰν κατορύξῃς ἐν τόποις τισίν, ὥστε αὐτὰ τὰ κέρατα τῆς γῆς ὑπερέχειν, εἶθ' ὕστερον ἀποπρίσῃς, λέγουσιν μελίττας ἐκπέτεσθαι· σαπέντα γὰρ αὐτὸν εἰς τοῦτο διαλύεσθαι τὸ ζῷον. ᾧ καὶ φαίνεται Φιλητᾶς προσέχειν, ἱκανῶς ὢν περίεργος· προσαγορεύει οὖν αὐτὰς βουγενεῖς λέγων·

βουγενέας φάμενος προσεβήσαο μακρὰ μελίσσας[3].

Varro, 'the most learned of the Romans,' twice mentions the subject in his extant works, although neither passage appears to be the one referred to in the *Geoponica*:—

Scio...ex hoc putrefacto nasci dulcissimas apes, mellis matres, a quo eas Graeci bugenes appellant[4].

... Apes nascuntur partim ex apibus partim ex bubulo corpore putrefacto[5].

[1] *Geoponica*, p. 440 § 21–p. 442 § 29.

[2] *De Generatione animalium*, III x.

[3] Antigoni Carystii *Historiarum Mirabilium Collectanea*, cap. xix. (23). Cf. Meleager *Anth. Pal.* IX. 363 *βουγενέεσσι μελίσσαις*, Erycius *Anth. Pal.* VII. 36 *βούπαισι μελίσσαις*, Archelaus *ap.* Varro III. 16 *βοὸς φθιμένης πεπλανημένα τέκνα*, Theocritus *Syrinx* 3 *ταυροπάτωρ* = 'bee.' Also Nicander *Ther.* 741 *ἵπποι γὰρ σφηκῶν γένεσις, ταύρων δὲ μέλισσαι...ἐξεγένοντο.*

[4] Varro, *de Re Rustica*, lib. 2, c. 5 § 5.

[5] Varro, *de Re Rustica*, lib. 3, c. 16 § 4.

Ovid also has the story :—

> Cognita res usu—de putri viscere passim
> Florilegae nascuntur apes...[1],

and although he ignores the wasps he knew where the hornets came from :—

> Pressus humo bellator equus crabronis origo est[2].

Pliny, the most uncritical of writers on Natural History, records :—

... in totum vero amissas reparari ventribus bubulis recentibus cum fimo obrutis[3].

The following quotation from Lampridius, who wrote towards the end of the third century, seems to indicate that Heliogabalus, or some of his court, were acquainted with the flies that mimic bees, 'tame-bees' Lampridius calls them :—

"Mittebat parasitis per cellarios salaria annua vasa cum ranis et scorpiis, et cum serpentibus, et huiusmodi monstris. Claudebat in ejuscemodi vasis infinitum muscarum *apes mansuetas* eas appellans[4]."

Servius, who flourished a century later, ascribes to Pliny a further development of the theory :—

"Sane sciendum Plinium dicere de bobus apes, de equis crabrones, de mulis fucos, de asinis vespas procreari[5]."

Aelian elaborated the myth :—

Ἵππος ἐρριμμένος σφηκῶν γένεσίς ἐστιν. ὃ μὲν γὰρ ὑποσήπεται, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ μυελοῦ ἐκπέτονται οἱ θῆρες οὗτοι, ὠκίστου ζῴου πτηνὰ ἔκγονα, τοῦ ἵππου οἱ σφῆκες[6].

We have seen how the Bugonia legend was widely spread in classical and later times. By the date of Aldrovandus, the ruler of the hive—who was till the time of the Stewarts still

[1] Ovid, *Metam.* xv. 365, 366.

[2] Ovid, *Metam.* xv. 368.

[3] Pliny, *Naturalis Historia*, lib. xi. sect. xx.

[4] Lampridius, *Life of Heliogabalus*, c. 26, p. 110 c. Paris, 1620.

[5] Servius ad Virg. *Georg.* 4. 286. Thilo iii. p. 342.

[6] Aelianus *de Natura Animalium*, Lib. i. xxviii.

thought to be a male—was derived from the brain of the bee-bearing beasts:—

"Aiunt ex cerebro gigni Reges, ex carnibus vero alias Apes[1]."

Ulysses Aldrovandus was a learned man and, as was the manner of his time, implicitly trusted the written word of the ancients. He was obviously worried at the absence of any reference to Bugonia in Aristotle:—

"Mirum insuper cur Aristoteles e boue nasci etiam non scripserit, quin nescierit. nam Plinius Virgilium citat, non Aristotelem":.

and he further in the following quotation sets forth the non-committal views of Galen as to how the thing happens:—

"Cur vero ex bobus putrefactis generentur apes occulta ratio est vel Galeno testante his verbis: 'Si quispiam vero a nobis naturae rationes quaerat, eam omnia a se ipsa doctam ex seque discentem agere sciat. Neque enim quo pacto vermes in plantis gignuntur, aut ex equis bobusque vespae atque apes, facile nos dicere licet, verum a natura simpliciter fiunt. Nam neque aves docet volare quispiam, neque nos intelligere, aut audire, videreve[2].'"

The explanation that Osten Sacken puts forward of the classical myth of Bugonia (apart from the Samson story) is indeed a very reasonable one. He believes that the legend has arisen from a confusion of two quite distinct insects, the Honey-Bee, *Apis mellifica*, and the Drone-Fly, *Eristalis tenax*, a fly which in coloration, size and behaviour is very like a bee. The thesis that Osten Sacken maintains is, that it is to this fly that the origin of the belief in Bugonia or, in other words, in ox-born bees, is due. In fact he holds that had this fly not existed the myth would never have arisen.

To begin with, he argues that *E. tenax* is very like a bee, more like a honey-bee than any other fly, the *Oestridae* being

[1] Aldrovandus *de Animalibus Insectis*. Bononiae, 1602, p. 58.

[2] This quotation is from the section entitled: "An Animal sit id, quod in utero est," cap. v. *Works*, Vol. XIX. Leipzig, 1830.

more like bumble-bees. Then, again, *E. tenax* lays its eggs on carcases which are decomposing, in the softening flesh of which their maggots crawl and feed. As Vergil tells us, these larvae 'at first are legless,' and this 'leglessness' of the larvae is very characteristic of the Diptera or flies. Further the larvae of flies do crawl, whereas the larvae of bees are motionless in their waxen cells. Finally the very common occurrence of *E. tenax* and the amazing rapidity of its reproduction have made it conspicuous even to the uninformed.

The common British name of the *Eristalis* and its allies is "Drone-fly," and the very name is an indication of the resemblance it shows to the honey-bee. This indeed is so marked as to make it difficult to persuade anyone but a trained entomologist to handle the fly, and the resemblance even deceives spiders: for should an *Eristalis* become involved in a spider's web, the spider will keep as far out of his victim's reach as though he were dealing with a bee. By letting out threads and rushing round and round the prey at a distance, the spider will immesh both a stinging-bee and an *Eristalis*. But it is an extraordinary thing that the spider, who apparently recognises its prey by touch and not by sight, recoils with alarm when he touches the harmless *Eristalis*, just as he does when he touches a bee.

The great naturalist Réaumur never dared to take one of these drone-flies into his hand without hesitation. "The colour, the size, the conformation and the proportions of the different parts of the body of these two insects...are very much alike." Both insects infest flowers and treat them in more or less the same manner. One could multiply, to almost any extent, quotations testifying to the resemblance of the Honey-bee to the Drone-fly.

One peculiarity of the larva or maggot of *Eristalis*, which has earned it the name of the "rat-tailed" larva (ver à queue de rat), is the long tail-like appendage at the end of the body. The tip of this tail bears the breathing orifice and the animal with this flexible and even telescopic tail, whose orifice is ever kept above the surface, is able to wallow deep in the decaying tissues of a carcase, in sewage or in other organic refuse, and

still maintain the communication of its interior with the outside air.

The maggot of *Eristalis* is very tenacious of life, and according to Geoffroy[1] "Cette larve vient aussi dans la bouillie des chiffons dont on fait le papier, sur quoi M. Linnæus observe un fait singulier, qu'on auroit peine à croire, s'il n'étoit assuré par un aussi grand Naturaliste. C'est que lorsq'on bat cette bouillie pour en faire du papier la larve quoique fortement frappée à coups de marteau, n'est point écrasée, ne périt point, et donne ensuite sa mouche." This extraordinary tenacity of life may possibly account for the success of *Eristalis tenax* in the struggle for existence. It has in quite recent times spread round the earth, and is now practically cosmopolitan in its distribution and, as Geoffroy points out, the progress of civilisation has simply offered it new breeding places. In ancient days a stray carcase or some rotting vegetation afforded it a home, but at the present time, with the indefinite extension of drains, sewers, cesspools and dung-heaps, it has infinite possibilities before it.

Not only in appearance and colour does this fly resemble the bee, but it has that peculiarly attractive habit of twitching its abdomen, probably the expression of its breathing movements, which is so characteristic of the members of the Order Hymenoptera.

We have seen how widely the myth of ox-born bees was held among the Greeks and Romans. There must have been some explanation of such a curious and firmly rooted belief, and Osten Sacken's explanation of the Drone-fly seems to fit all the recorded passages which I have been able to find in Classical literature. But I think he goes beyond his brief when he extends the theory to include Samson and his riddle. I believe that Samson did find a hive in the dried and mummified carcase of a lion and that the honey he ate was real—not imaginary—honey.

A. E. SHIPLEY.

CHRIST'S COLLEGE LODGE,
CAMBRIDGE. *July* 1914.

[1] *Histoire abrégée des Insectes*, Vol. II. p. 521, 1764.

FRAGMENTS OF GREEK POETRY FROM PAPYRI IN THE LIBRARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

(*Read before the Oxford Philological Society.*)

Column I.

. . . . . .

κα]λῶν ὑμεναίων

] θιασείαις

ἀ]νδράσι τερπνοῖς

] ἀοιδήν

] ἀρίσστοις

]να καὶ καλὰ τηση

]ν βασιλῆα

]α πελοιο μεγ[

]σι πλεύροι[ς

χθον]ὸς ἡμετέρη[ς

] μηλοιο

]μοιο

μ]εγισστο[

] . [

. . . . . .

Column II.

σὺν δ' ἀλ[ό]χοις σεμναῖς[ι] φίλαις καὶ παῖδας ἐφήβους
σεμνοῖς . . . . μεγαλο[.] . ρχησομαι . [.] . αε[. .] . νη
χαίρετ' αλ . . τιωτ . . ταμακ[. .]ον[. .]ν πολ[. .] . . νη[
σὺν χθονὶ κα[ὶ] μερόπεσσι καὶ ἀθανάτοισι με[γ]ίσστοις
Ἀρσινόα Πτολεμα[ΐ] παλαιγενὲς οὔνομα [. . . . .] . ον
ἣν μάκαρες προβ . . . [.]ν πανδ[. . . .]αλ[. . . . .] . ον
ὦ μερόπων . [.]τ . [. .]γει . η καλῶς τε . ο[12 letters] .ς
Ζηνὶ σὺν ἀθανάτων μάλα δα . [13 letters]ς
τοις κα . ακ . [.] . μονα πᾶσι βροτ[οῖ]ς φ[11 letters]α
πρῶτον μεν γὰρ ἔχεν πρόσσθεν πουτ[. . . . .]στου
ε . . [.]μ . νομενας νήων τὸ πολυσσθενὲς ὅπλον
μέχρι . . . . . ννα . τον ἀλαίκκτυπον ἡ γεγαῶσα
ου . . . . τ[.]ν προμο . χροσσους χθονὸς ἠδὲ πολήων
φο[.] ν . . . . [. .] πρόπασα κρατοῦσα σὺ πόντον ὀπάζεις
α . . . . . [.] περὶ νῶτα καλοῖς τε . [. . . . . ὁ]πλίζῃ
[. .] . ων ἀμφιπόλων σὺν κλε[9 letters]οεσσα[
[.] . δε . . ἀθανάτων προκαθηγ . [9 letters] . τ . [
[ἀ]μφίπολοι σσκοπέλοισιν ὁμοῦ τ[
[.] ἀναφυλάσσουσιν πτόλιν ἡμετέ[ρην
[.]ρμαχ[. .]εν πρῶτα πατὴρ ἀνδρ[ῶν τε θεῶν τε
[.]τειχ[. .] . φαεσνὰ περισστη . . . [.]θ[
[. .]κειθ[. .]σιολ[.]γως [σ]ὺν καλλ[ι]πυρο[
[13 letters ἐ]ν οὐρανῷ ἀσστε[ρόεντι
[10 letters] . τοιο Κρονείονος πα[
[7 letters ἀθα]νάτων ὑπερέξοχ[ος ἄλλων
[10 letters] καλῶν κόλπων μα[

Column III.

λ[10 letters] *ἀσστ[ρ]άπτουσα γελᾷ τ[ϵ]ρπνοῖσι προσώποις*
κ[10 letters] *θαλασσόπορον χαροποῦ δ' ἀπ[ὸ] πόντου*
ϵ[10 letters]*α . αποστ*[. . . .] . *π*[. .] . [.] *δ' ἀθανάτων τε*
α[10 letters] . *ει θυμο*[. . . . .]*φεν ἀν' ἀφρόν.*
ὦ [*καλὴ* 'Αφρ]*ογένεια γαμο*[*σ*]*στόλε καὶ χάρι τερπνή*
χ[10 letters]*α τύπον γλυκεραῖσι παρηιάδεσσιν*
τω[10 letters] . *ϵ* . . *βλεφάρων θαλεροὶ πηδῶσι*[*ν*] *ἔρωτες*
ἐκγ δ[*ὲ* . . . .]*νεων μαζῶν δροσεραὶ θάμα δα . αι*
καὶ ἐκ[. . . . .]*ων ξανθοῖο κόμη*[.] *μυροβοσστρυχόεντος*
ἡδυτατ . [. .] . . *ωρσ ἰδανόχροα ἵπποταται ἄνθη*
ἡ [*κ*]*αὶ πρὸς θαλά*[*μ*]*οις μείξασα καλῶν ὑμεναίων*
[. .] . *νως μὲν νύνφην παπα πασσάσιν ἀνδρὶ ποθητήν*
[*ἐυθ*]*άδε τῇ νύνφῃ πρὸς λε . . . τ . . . λον σὺ χαρίζι*
ω[.] *μὲν χη . ϵ . . . ων τειμᾶν σε φύσις νενόμισσται*
σεμνοτ[*άτη* . . .]*γει τὸν σὸν συνόμευνον ἄνασσα*
. [.] . . [. . . . .] *ἀνθρώποισι φίλον καὶ σύμμαχον ὄντα*
[10 letters]*ντον ταμ* . [. . . .]*ρος αἰθ*[.]*ρ*[
[10 letters] . *γοισ* . [.] . [. . . . .]*γορ*[
[12 letters] . . *μ*[. . . . .]*ειρ*[
[13 letters] . *οτ*[
[12 letters] . *ϵ* . [

. . . . .

Column IV.

τοὺς ἱεροὺς τη[
ἄρμα ἀνάγων δια[
ἠέλιος φαέθων [. . .]α . . . [
ὦ φιλοκέρτομε δ[. .]ον . [
αἰεὶ γὰρ μύθοισι πα . ν[.] . . . [.
πτηνοὺς ἐς πάντας ἔρωτας μὴ φαινομένους δ . [. .] .
τοὺς μερόπων μεταλλωντας . [.]γοις φρένα καρτερόεσσιν
μῦθον μὲν τοῦτον παρελώμεθα εἰσὶ δ' ἔρωτες
σεμνῶς οἱ κατὰ κόσσμον ἐπ' ἀνδράσι δῶρα φέροντες
πρῶτα μὲν Ἠέλ[ι]ος μετέπειτά τε [δ]ῖα Σελήνη
μόκχθοις ρα . [. . . .]ολλ . . [.]μαλ . . . α[.]να [φ]έροντες
ο[.]εν μὲν θνησκοντ[11 letters ἀ]πολεῖψαι
τερπνῶν στοιχησοντ[13 letters]α δικαίως
ου[. . .]ατηρασγ . πα[15 letters] . ες ἡμεῖν
αμ [. . . . .]α θνητοῖς
[. . . . .] . ἔργων
[. . . . . , ...]οιο

. . . . .

Column V.

α[
τ[
ο[
ω[
α[5
δ[
α . [
σεμ[
π[
τ . [10
καρμηλω[ν
τον τρις πο[
κα . . [. . .]ω . [
τοῖς νε[
ων κα . [15
σὸὺς ἀρε[
πρωτα[
Ζεῦ [
κ[
. . . .

COLUMN VI.

] πολὺν ἠέρα καὶ χθόνα δείαν
] καὶ σύσσπορα τερπνὰ τὰ γαίης
]αρ ὁμοῦ χλοεροῖς σπορ[ί]μοισιν
] δροσερῶν ἀνέμοιο λαβόντα
]αι καιροῖς ἰδίοισι δοθέντων
] μέγαν οὐρανὸν ὀλβίοτα Ζεῦ
] . ο Κρονείονος ἀνκυλομήτου
] . . εοι δέ τ' ἔχοι πρὸς Ὄλυμπον
]ταν ερανοβιην γόνον ὠκύν
]ραν ἱερᾶς χθονὸς ἡμετέρῃσιν
]αι . αστερον ἡγεμονῆα
] καὶ ἀρισστέας ἧς παλάμῃσιν
] κρατερώτατα φοῖλα γιγάντ[ω]ν
]ων γένος ἄγριον ἀνδρῶν
] . . [. .] . . [. .] . . . αλων κατὰ κῦμα θαλάττης
]ε . [. . . .]τον ἐπὶ κχθονὶ <καὶ> κατὰ πόντου
]ασεινας[. . . .]τον ἐκγ Διὸς ὀβριμεφυ . της
] . . [. .]υσ[. . ἑ]κατηβελέταο ἄνακτος
τὸ]ν ἠύκομος τέκε Λητώ
] κορυφαῖς λασιωτίδος ὕλης
] . α βροτοῖς καὶ σε . . . . υωγοι
] . . . ν[.]μοι . προ . . . . πων
]ν[.]ρκον[.]δε[.] . [δ]αίμων
] . . τὸν κλαδόνα σφιν ἐλαίας
]ωντο πολυσσταφυλ[.] . ων . .
] . ἐπ' ἀγνώσστοις ἐπιλοιβαί'
] μαντικὸν οἵ δ' ἐκάλουν τε

Column VII.

τὸν κα[
ὃν δὲ κα[
πρὸς μ[
νυκκτ[
ἀνδρα[
ἀλλ . . [
πρωτ[
σεμν[
ἐν μακ[
θυμος [
υ . . η[
τοῖς κ[
ὦ παῖ τ[
χρυσο[
βαχχ[
καὶ π[
παντ[
κυμα[
σεμν[
πληκτ[
κολπ[
ξανθ[
ευρο[
ἡδὺν [
εἰν δω[
καὶ ἐκ[

Column VIII.

κηθα συν[
πόντον α[
οὐχὶ ελ[
γαίην δ[
μὴ πον[
τὰς πλ[
ἥστο μ[
νάματ[
κλειθ[
ἀλλὰ σ[
τὸν στ[υγερὸν
ἄσσον [
η[
δ[
[
α[
χ[

Probably nine lines are wanting.

Column IX.

[14 letters] *καθ*[
[14 letters]*πιφ*[
ἔνθα δ' ἐν ὀπφ[*θ*]*α*[*λ*]*μοῖσ*[*ι*
ὄχλον ἐπερχομένων α . [
θηπτο μαν ἐς μέγα κῦμα π[
καλὴν τε Ἀνδρομέδαν ἐν[
θῆρα δὲ καὶ βύθιον στυγεροῦ [
ἄνγελον οὐχὶ καλῆς βουλ[*ῆς*
[. .]*αρ ἐστὶν ὁ δὴ κατεπλε . . [*
[*τοὺ*]*ς μὲν γὰρ φεύγοντας [*
[.] . *τος δὴ καμάτο*[*ι*]*ο συ*[
[*τ*]*ὴν δὲ σιδηρεόεσσι βρόχ*[*οις*
[*ἀ*]*λκυονὶς χήρα παρὰ κύμ*[*ατα*
[*τ*]*ῶν κα*[*ι*]*νῶν μύθων ε . [*
[*ἀν*]*τιλάλων γενετῶν μ*[
[*ἔκ*]*γδοτον Ἀν*[*δ*]*ρομέδαν τ*[
[. . . .]*η . . . . . [.]ταχει να*[
[. . . . .]*νόστου τοῦτον [*
[. . . . .]*ννε*[.]*νετ*[. . .]*ομ*[
[10 letters]*ταιση . [. .]κχ*[
[10 letters]*ονιω*[
[10 letters]*τοσπο*[
[10 letters]*ησαντ*[
[10 letters]*αραπ*[
. . . . . .

Column X.

]. [. . .]ανηχους
]. . Ἄρτεμ[ι]ν ἁγνὴν
] δ' ἄρα τὴν τρισὶ μορφαῖς
]ηον ἀγλαὴν κούραν
]εσιν ὀπφθαλμοῖσιν
τ]ετακγμένοι μύσσται
] σοφὸν κικλήσκουσιν
μαν]τικὸν ὄντα προφήτη[ν
]λαροισιν ἐν ἄθλοις
]ριησιν
σ]ελασσφόρον ἄρμα
] παρέχεις φάος ἡδὺν
] μαντικὲ Παιάν
]ακλονω [.] Διόνυσε

Traces of one line, then probably eleven lines wanting.

Column XI.

Probably three lines wanting.

]ησκεσ[
]. σ' ἔφυσ . [
]αδε καὶ [
]μεοιο βυ[. . . .] . δα . . λο[
]κληρο . [.] . δ[. .]μ . . . κπ[
ἀργ]υρέου γελα δ . . . . ἀνδρα[
] μοκχθοῦσά τέ μητρητ . [
]α θαλασσοπ . . . ο . θ . ω[

με]γάλην . . . . [. .] . τ . ενα[
]ντ . . . . ετι . . [.] καλη[
]αιν . α[. .] . . . . [. .] Ποσειδ[ῶν
] . αφθ . . ν . . . στοις δαν[
]σ ἀνθρωπ . . . . . [.] . . [
]αδουμ . . . σι θαλάττη[
]θρονο[. . .] . . οιοσ [.] . ον[
]πεστο[. . .]δεον με . μ[
]μαλλ[. .] ἄνηκε βροτο[
] ἔφυ δ [.]ο . . ο . παλλησε . [
]ανα[. . .] . . [.] ἱερὰν π[
] . ογα . [.]τ . . . ερισας λα[
] . κο . [. . .] . . . συνηφ[
]ουρ[. . . .] . να πολυχ[
] . [.] . [. . . . .]οιο φίλοι[

Frag. i. Goodspeed's Fragment H.

. . . . .
] . . [
]πουτ[
]οτ . υσχον . [. .]ας
]ρες η . πε βέλεμνα
ἐ]πὶ τῷδε φαρέτρας
π]τερόεν[τ]ας ὀισστούς
] . . . . . ρ ἐπ' αὐτῷ
]αλλα . . . [. .]ς
] . [
] . [
. . . . . .

Frag. ii. Goodspeed's Fragment I.

. . . .
]τον δ[
]νεαπο[
] ἅρμα κυμ[
]τ᾽ αἰγίδας α[
χα]λεποῖο [5
. . . .

Frag. iii.

Top of column.

ὀ]λλβίστου [
]α[.]εσοορτ[
]τ[
. . . .

These papyri, which were written about the end of the second century A.D., were acquired in Egypt by Professor Goodspeed, of the University of Chicago, who first transcribed, published, and described them in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1903, p. 237 sqq., adding a few suggestions which had been made by Professor Blass; but Blass had only copies or photographs to work with, and not the originals. Professor Goodspeed published them again in 1908 in a collection called *Chicago Literary Papyri*, and incorporated some suggestions by Dr Ludwich, but he too had only photographs: Professor Schubart also made suggestions, but the condition in which the text was left was still incomplete and unsatisfactory. It is owing to this fact that the fragments have not received much notice. My attention was directed to them in collecting the fragments of poetry of the Alexandrian age, and it seemed likely that a fresh collation would clear up some of the doubtful points. The only course open was to ask Professor Goodspeed to send the papyri to Oxford, and with the greatest generosity

he consented, and Professor Hunt was kind enough to collate them. I take this opportunity of thanking Professor Goodspeed for his singular courtesy, and Professor Hunt for his ungrudging co-operation and valuable suggestions.

The work of Professor Hunt has been:

(1) To determine the order and position of these fragments. His discovery that Fragment A and B of Goodspeed in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* are the same; that is, that A preserves the beginning of the lines, and B the ends of them, has been one of the most important. These put together now form Col. ii in this paper.

(2) To recollate the lines. This was absolutely necessary, and great changes have been made in the Goodspeed text. The revised text of Professor Hunt supersedes it.

(3) To make it probable that all the fragments formed part of one book which contained several poems; and he has been the first to notice two parallel lines in Col. xi, which mark the beginning of a new poem.

We have here then another Florilegium, to be added to the six which have been already discovered among papyri. But in spite of Professor Hunt's work, the text remains provokingly obscure and tantalising. Maas s.v. Hymenaios in Pauly-Wissowa, having only Goodspeed's first recension in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, calls the fragment "a still unexplained papyrus." It remains to be seen whether the new collation throws more light upon it.

It appears to be a collection of Hymns; Cols. iii, iv, and perhaps ii containing a Hymn to Aphrodite[1]; Col. vi one to Apollo; Col. vii perhaps one to Dionysus (cf. l. 15); Col. x to Artemis-Hecate; Col. xi possibly to Aphrodite; Col. xii possibly to Apollo. A development of this view will be found in the commentary.

[1] Or Aphrodite-Isis. The Hymn to Isis (Abel p. 295, Kaibel 1028) found at Andros, l. 37, 38 *γενέθλας | ἀρχὰν ἀνδρὶ γυναῖκα συνήγαγον*, and still more the fragments of column iii in Abel (not given by Kaibel) *-θελγέος ἠδ' ἀμαρυγᾶς* (104), *παστώς* (110), *ὑμεναίοις* (111), show a similarity with our fragments.

Column I. There is no necessary connection with Col. ii, which is a separate fragment, but the diction is similar.

Column II is composed of Goodspeed's Fragments A and B, put together by Professor Hunt.

2. *ὀρχήσομαι* is possible.

5. *ἄμεμπτον* H. W. Garrod.

9. Probably *τοῖς κατὰ κόσσμον ἅπασι.*

For *κόσσμον* and *κατὰ κόσσμον*, cf. Col. iv, 9, 10. *βροτοῖσι φιλοφρονέουσα*, H. W. Garrod. *φ[ίλα δῶρα φέροντ]α*, J. A. Smith, *φέρουσα*, M. N. Tod.

10. Probably *πόντ[οιο μεγίσ]στου.*

11. The ductus litterarum suggests *ἐξαναδυομένας*, but there is no accusative plural for it to agree with, and there are no Doric forms of the genitive feminine in the papyrus.

νήων τὸ πολυσσθενὲς ὅπλον might be a steering-paddle, or an anchor, or a cable, but hardly oars, for the plural would be required.

12. *ἁλίκτυπον* is meant.

17. *προκαθηγέτις* occurs as a title of Athene, *CIG* 4332, *προκαθηγέτης* in *CIG* 5039 = Kaibel 1023, as an epithet of the god Μανδοῦλις who was identified with Apollo: *προκαθηγήτειρα*, W. R. Hardie, is possible.

18. *ἀμφιπόλοις σκοπέλοισιν*, Goodspeed.

Possibly *ἀμφίπολοι σκοπέλοισιν*: Buck, *Greek Dialects*, s. 101, quotes *τὸ σσκέλος, τοῦ σστεφάνου* for the doubling of *σ* at the beginning of a word, which is rarer than the doubling in the middle.

19. [*οἳ*] or [*καὶ*] *ἀναφυλάσσουσιν.*

20. *ἕρμα*, M. N. Tod, *ἕρμα χέεν*, W. R. Hardie.

⟨*μὲν*⟩ *πρῶτα*, T. C. Snow, *ἀνδ[ρῶν τε θεῶν τε]*, Goodspeed.

21. *φαεσνὰ* is a mistake for *φαεινὰ* or *φαεννὰ*.

22. *καλλιπυλο[* H. W. Garrod.

24. Perhaps *ὑπά]τοιο.*

The Π of ΠΑ[is certain in Pap., but wrong.

20—26. Professor W. R. Hardie suggests the following as giving the general sense:

> ἕρμα χέεν μὲν πρῶτα πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε,
> καὶ τείχιζε φαεινὰ περιστήσας λιθάδεσσι
> .....ὁδοῖς σὺν καλλιπόροισι
> μήνης ἠύτε κύκλον ἐν οὐρανῷ ἀστερόεντι·
> τοῖον ἔην ὑπάτοιο Κρονίονος ἄφθιτον ἔργον
> ἔξοχον, ὥσπερ ὅ γ' ἀθανάτων ὑπερέξοχος ἄλλων.

Col. i is not necessarily connected with Col. ii, but the words preserved in it point to a connection. In Col. ii, *παλαιγενές* is certain: the reading must be, and Pap. permits it, *Ἀρσινόα Πτολεμαΐ*, "Arsinoe of Ptolemaeus, an ancient name." What does this mean? (1) It might be an address to one of the towns in Egypt, Cyprus, or elsewhere, called Arsinoe, founded by Ptolemy Philadelphus. In Egypt there was one, the capital of the Arsinoite Nome, and another near Canopus; in Cyprus there were at least three, one on the north-west coast; one on the south-east near Salamis; the other is unimportant. Arsinoe on the north-west coast is in the middle of the cult-districts of Aphrodite, and not far from Paphos, where the myth of Aphrodite *Ἀναδυομένη* was localised. Strabo, xiv, 6. 3, says that there was an annual Panegyris with a procession of men and women from Paphus to Palaepaphus: *πανηγυρίζουσι διὰ τῆς ὁδοῦ ταύτης κατ' ἔτος ἐπὶ τὴν Παλαίπαφον ἄνδρες ὁμοῦ γυναιξὶ συνιόντες, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἄλλων πόλεων.* These words illustrate Col. ii, lines 1, 2, an address to the country with all its inhabitants: cf. *Orphic Hymn*, 55, 26.

Strabo, *ib.*, further says that there are many temples of Aphrodite on the heights of Cyprus (cf. *σκοπέλοισιν*, Col. ii, 18), e.g. the promontory Olympus on the north-east *ἔχουσα Ἀφροδίτης Ἀκραίας ναὸν ἄδυτον γυναιξὶ καὶ ἀόρατον.*

The Arsinoe on SE. is near Salamis: it is curious that a little south of it is Cap Greco, the ancient Pedalium. Now Pedalium is *Πηδάλιον*, "oar-paddle," and that is perhaps the meaning of the words in line 11 *νήων τὸ πολυσθενὲς ὅπλον* "ship's powerful tool." Strabo, (*ib.*) *εἶτ' Ἀρσινόη πόλις καὶ λιμήν· εἶτ' ἄλλος λιμὴν Λεύκολλα· εἶτ' ἄκρα Πηδάλιον, ἧς ὑπέρκειται*

λόφος τραχὺς ὑψηλὸς τραπεζοειδὴς ἱερὸς Ἀφροδίτης. If this interpretation is correct, it is curious that di Cesnola, *Salaminia*, p. 124, gives from pre-Hellenic cylinders several figures of a personage holding what is probably a ship's steering-oar, to judge by the cross handle; a view which is taken by Professor Sayce.

Hymns to localities are not unknown. Besides Callimachus' Hymn to Delos there is a Προσόδιον εἰς Δῆλον by Eumelus, Bergk, *PLG*, iii, and one to the river, or the river-god, Alpheus, *A. P.* ix, 362, and one to Rome, by Melinno, ap. Stob. vii 13, in Sapphics (see Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. Hymnos).

Secondly: one naturally thought at first, seeing the names of Ptolemy and Arsinoe in the same line, followed by many references to Aphrodite and marriage, that here were fragments of the lost poem of Callimachus on the marriage of Ptolemy Philadelphus and his sister Arsinoe in 278 or 274—authorities differ. A line of this, the only line known, is preserved in Schol. to Pindar, *Nem.* ii 1 (Schneider, *Call. Frag.* 196). Ἀρσινόης, ὦ ξεῖνε, γάμον καταβάλλομ' ἀείδειν. This line shows that it was not an Epithalamium as Bloch thinks, that is, a Hymn sung to the married pair, but a Hymn on the occasion of the wedding. I will return to this view presently.

But putting together (1) Ἀρσινόα Πτολεμαΐ ii, 5, (2) νύνφην iii, 12, συνόμευνον ἄνασσα iii, 15, (3) Ἀφροδίτη and the description of her birth, (4) ἀμφίπολοι (?) ii, 18, I am inclined to think that Arsinoe the wife and sister of Ptolemy Philadelphus is meant: and that this poem was not written on the occasion of her marriage, but that she is here addressed as the deified Arsinoe Aphrodite. Now Arsinoe was deified as Ἀφροδίτη probably during her life-time, though there has been some controversy on this point. And since Cyprus was full of temples to Aphrodite, it follows that Arsinoe might well be worshipped there. There was a special reason why Arsinoe should be identified with and deified as Aphrodite. "One of the things" says Mr Tarn in his recent book on Antigonus "on which Arsinoe had left the distinct mark of her strenuous personality, was Egypt's rule of the sea. It is significant that one of the best harbours in the Aegean, which the Egyptian fleet was

to use as its base in the Chremonidean war, was re-christened by her name, as was the naval port which Egypt was to seize later in the Argolid." (Tarn, *Antigonus Gonatas*, p. 292.) This makes her identification with Aphrodite *Θαλασσία*, the sea-goddess, very appropriate. There are many traces of her in the islands: many stones have been found, some in Cyprus, bearing the words *Ἀρσινόης Φιλαδέλφου*, of which various interpretations have been given.

In Delos Arsinoe took a special interest (Tarn, *Antigonus*, p. 201—2): "there was erected on the island, either by her or in her honour, a building called the Philadelpheion, which contained her picture; and it was no doubt at her request that Callimachus wrote his Hymn to Delos to be sung at the federal Ptolemaieia, with its allusion to the events of 274 and its curious attempt to show that Ptolemy had borne his part in the contest against the Gauls" by drowning his Gallic mercenaries who revolted in that year. And it is noticeable that Col. vi has names of two of the three gods of Delos, Apollo, Artemis and Leto. Does Col. vi 14 refer to the Gauls? Pausanias and the Delphic Hymns lately discovered speak of the defence of Delphi by Apollo. Line 4 might very well refer to Cyprus. *χθονί* and *σκοπέλοισι* show that it cannot be either of the places in Egypt named Arsinoe, for there are no cliffs there: but the country round Arsinoe in the north-west of Cyprus has *σκόπελοι*, nor would it be incorrect to call *Πηδάλιον*, Cap Greco, which is near the south-eastern Arsinoe, *σκόπελος*, and Strabo's words justify this.

As then Callimachus wrote a Hymn to Delos introducing into it references to the greatness of Ptolemy, so this composition might be a Hymn to Cyprus, to be sung at some festival, and introducing the deification of Arsinoe, and that is the title which I should be disposed to give it.

One other point may be added in support of Cyprus. In Col. iv, line 5 sqq., there is a reference to some *μῦθος* which the poet checks himself from giving fully. The text is unfortunately fragmentary. Salamis is the locality of the story of Iphis and Anaxarete as Ovid tells it in *Metam.* xiv 698—760, and Hermesianax in his second poem to Leontion (we

have no fragments of it); it is summarised in Antoninus Liberalis, 39, who gives the names as Arceophon and Arsinoe. Arsinoe rejected Arceophon's secret passion, he died, and she after watching his funeral out of curiosity was turned into a stone, which was shown at Salamis.

> dominae sub imagine signum
> Servat adhuc Salamis; Veneris quoque nomine templum
> Prospicientis habet; (l. 759)

that is, 'Αφροδίτη παρακύπτουσα, "the Peeping Aphrodite." See Farnell, *Cults*, II 754. Can this be the μῦθος referred to here?

We now come to the question of the authorship of the fragment. Two poems on the deification of Arsinoe are extant: they are by the contemporary epigrammatist Posidippus. The first is a comparatively recent discovery (Schott, Posidipp. 2, *Anthol. Pal.* Cougny, III, 80), having been first published by H. Weil from a papyrus in 1879. The subject is the dedication to her of a temple at Zephyrium near Canopus.

Ep. 2. ἔνθα με Καλλικράτης ἱδρύσατο καὶ βασιλίσσης
ἱερὸν 'Αρσινόης Κυπρίδος ὠνόμασεν κ.τ.λ.

Ep. 3 (ap. Athen. iii, 318 D)

Κυπρίδος ἱερὸν 'Αρσινόης
.....ἐπὶ Ζεφυριτίδος ἄκτης.

There is reason for thinking that Posidippus wrote a poem in hexameters probably called Αἰσώπεια; there is also a Posidippus who wrote about Cyprus: Mueller thinks he was the epigrammatist, Susemihl does not; Schott, the recent editor of Posidippus, leaves it uncertain. But Posidippus' extant epigrams have no points of similarity with this poem; and though he mentions above the deified Arsinoe, there is no further reason for supposing him to be the author of it.

It would be a satisfaction if we could show that this fragment is from the lost poem by Callimachus on the marriage of Ptolemy and Arsinoe, particularly as Wilamowitz has lately published in the Berlin *Sitzungsberichte* (1912, XXIX, p. 524 sqq.) fragments of a lyric poem by Callimachus on her death

in 270. No doubt in Col. i *ὑμέναιοι* and *θιάσειαι* occur, but it is not certain whether Col. ii succeeds i immediately, nor does the fragment in the Pindar Scholium with its address *ὦ ξεῖνε* cohere with the address *χαίρετε* in our fragment line 3, although it is true that the opening of our fragment has been lost.

But the chief argument against the Callimachean authorship is the style, which is free, flowing, and artless; and the treatment of the metre, especially the caesura in the 4th foot, is not Callimachean[1]. On the other hand, *μῦθον μὲν παρελώμεθα* reminds one, if *παρελώμεθα* means "praetereamus," of the way in which Callimachus checks himself at the opening of the long fragment of the *Αἴτια* published by Professor Hunt in *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. VII, l. 4

Ἥρην γάρ κοτέ φασι—κύον, κύον, ἴσχεο.

The question of the authorship must at present be left undetermined. The diction sometimes recalls the Orphica, and the tone resembles the Hymn to Adonis in Theocritus xv. The poem may be not much earlier than the papyrus: but we may provisionally assign it to the first century B.C., possibly the first century A.D.

Column III. 1, 2, suppl. Goodspeed.

1—4 probably are an aetiological account of the name *Ἀφροδίτη* (E. A. Barber).

2. For *χαροπός* in connection with Aphrodite cf. Antipater, *Anth. Pal.* IX, 143, 5

Ἰλάσκευ τὴν Κύπριν, ἐγὼ δέ σοι ἢ ἐν ἔρωτι
οὔριος, ἢ χαροπῷ πλεύσομαι ἐν πελάγει

and Anacreontea, 54, 11.

5. Suppl. Goodspeed.

6. *χαρτὸν ἐνεῖσα*, H. W. Garrod.

παρηια δ εστιν, Goodspeed; but *σσ* and *στ* resemble each

[1] On this as a mark of an inartistic metrician, see Diels on the Paean of Isyllus, in *Sibyllinische Blätter*, p. 61: it is frequent in Isyllus.

other in this Pap., cf. *πασσάσιν* in l. 12, and we may with certainty read *παρηιάδεσσιν*.

7. *βλεφάρων*, conj. E. A. Barber (afterwards verified from Pap.), *τῶν ἀπὸ καὶ ἐκ βλεφάρων*, H. W. Garrod; rather short, unless there was some dittography.

8. *ἔκ γε δὴ εὐαγέων μαζῶν δροσέρ' ἄνθεμ' ὄδωδε* H. W. Garrod, but this is rather far from Pap. Perhaps *ἐκ δ' ἄρα χιονέων* and *θάμα*, or *ἀμαρυγαί*, cf. n. on p. 118, and Theocr. xxiii, 7.

9. Perhaps *ἐκ κροτάφων*.

ξανθοὶ πλόκαμοι μυροβοστρυχόεντες, H. W. Garrod.

10. *ῥοδανόχροα*, E. A. Barber.

ἡδύτατ' ἀμφ' ὤμους ἰδανόχροας, H. W. Garrod.

11. *καὶ* and *θαλάμοις*, Goodspeed; *ἦσαι*, H. W. Garrod.

12. *σεμνῶς*, J. A. Smith; *παρὰ πασστάσιν* (E. A. Barber) is convincing, cf. 6.

13. *ἐνθάδε*, Goodspeed; *ἄνδρα δὲ τῇ νύμφῃ πρὸς λέκτρα φίλον σὺ χαρίζει*, W. R. Hardie.

14. *μερόπων*, Hunt.

15. Suppl. Goodspeed. Perhaps *θέλγει*.

17. Perhaps *πόντον τ'*.

πρὸς αἰθέρα δίαν, J. A. Smith.

Column IV follows Col. iii directly; presumably it is a part of the same poem.

4. Perhaps *δαῖμον*, Hermes; vid. Roscher, *Epith. Deor.*

5. Perhaps *πλαν-*.

6. The scribe has dislocated the line: *πτηνοὺς ἐς πάντας ἔρωτας* is clearly the end.

7. *μεταλλῶντας* has not yet been cleared up. Perhaps *ἄγεις*. H. W. Garrod suggests *τοὺς μερόπων ἔργοις φρένα καρτερόεσσι πλανῶντας*: the dislocation may well have affected this line also.

8. *παρελώμεθα* may mean "let us withdraw"; less probably "let us adopt." H. W. Garrod would take it = *praetervehamur*, from *παρελάομαι*.

14. *ἡμῖν*.

Column V follows iv directly.

Column VI. Its relation to the preceding columns is unknown. This appears to be from a Hymn to Apollo: the first five lines may refer to Egypt and may be compared with the praises of Egypt in Theocritus xvii. Line 26 contains a new reference to *Θεοὶ ἄγνωστοι* which may be added to Norden's instances. Lines 9—13 may contain a reference to the retreat of the Gauls from Delphi (*γένος ἄγριον ἀνδρῶν*).

3. Suppl. Hunt.

6. *ὀλβίοτα* Pap. may be right, *ὄλβιστε*, ap. Goodspeed, *ὄλβιέ τε Ζεῦ*, A. D. Godley.

9. *κεραυνοβίην*, Goodspeed.

13. *φῦλα*, Goodspeed.

16. ⟨*καὶ*⟩, Goodspeed.

17. The new collation here is important, as destroying the word *βριαρεοφόντης* which Herwerden had inserted in the Appendix to his Lexicon, from this place.

23. Perhaps *δαίμων*.

24. *κλαδόνες· κλάδοι.* Hesych.

26. Suppl. *θεοῖσιν*. The stop is in Pap.

Column VII is continuous with Col. vi.

Column VIII. A loose fragment, the relation of which to the preceding column is unknown; but *πόντου*, l. 2, *γαίην* 4, *ἦστο* 7, *νᾶμα* 8, point to a connection with Col. ix, and render probable *τὸν στυγερὸν* (Hunt) sc. *θῆρα* in l. 11 (cf. ix, 7).

Column IX. 5. *ὦρτο* cannot be read, although the words suggest Frag. Anon. ap. Callim. Schneider, vol. II, p. 738, no. 136 *ὦρτο μὲν μέγα κῦμα*, but that fragment needs correction.

9. *ἄρ' ἄρ'* ?

10—16. Supplements by Goodspeed.

11. ὄντος Hunt.

The column contains the account of Andromeda and the sea-monster, and suggests a question of some interest to Latin scholars. There is a marked similarity to the episode of Perseus and Andromeda in Manilius v, 540 sqq., the only romantic part of his poem: cf. 569 sqq.

> Ter circum Alcyones pennis planxere volantes,
> Fleveruntque tuos miserando carmine casus,
> Et tibi contextas umbram fecere per alas:
> Ad tua sustinuit fluctus spectacula pontus,
> Adsuetasque sibi desiit perfundere rupes.

l. 13 ἀλκυονὶς χήρα may well have been the original of *v.* 559, 560, for such a touch could hardly have been invented by Manilius. Other phrases also are like Manilius; Ἔκδοτον 16, cf. Man. v, 540 dirorum culpa parentum | Prodidit; βρόχοις 12, cf. Man. v, 552 iniectaque vincla: μέγα κῦμα 5, cf. Man. v, 580 gravidus iam surgere pontus | coeperat. The connection with Ovid, *Metam.* iv, 662 sqq., is less apparent; but the felicitous new compound ἀντιλάλων (ἀντιλάλων γενετῶν, l. 15) is like *Metam.* iv, 669 maternae pendere linguae Andromedan poenas. It appears likely therefore that we can date this poem as earlier than Manilius, and possibly earlier than Ovid, and that we may consider it as the Alexandrian Ἐπύλλιον from which they drew.

Column X is a loose fragment unconnected with the others and is apparently from a Hymn to Isis (who was assimilated to many Greek deities as early as the Ptolemaic age), to Apollo and to Dionysus. Professor Hunt first pointed out the curious and unparalleled mixture of Hexameters and Scazons: lines 4, 6, 7, are apparently Scazons.

2. Ἄρτεμιν, Hunt.

l. 3 refers to Hecate τρικάρηνος: cf. e.g. Abel, *Orph. Hymni Magici*, v, 23 sq. Ἄρτεμι Περσεφόνη...τρικάρανε...τριπρόσωπε, τριαύχενε.

5. λιπαυγέσιν, Goodspeed.

8. μαντικὸν, Hunt.

12. ἡδύν is a mistake in Pap. for ἡδύ.

13, 14. Text, Hunt.

Column XI. Its relation to the previous columns is unknown. The surface of this fragment is much worn, and no general sense can be made out: possibly l. 6 refers to Aphrodite. Professor Hunt first noticed two parallel lines after l. 3, which point to the beginning of a new poem.

6. Perhaps ἀργυρέου.

8. θαλασσοπόροιο, Goodspeed.

9. μεγάλην, Hunt.

Frag. i is a loose fragment. 4, 5, 6 may refer to Apollo.

Frag. ii is a loose fragment. χαλεποῖο, Hunt.

Frag. iii is a loose fragment, not printed by Goodspeed.

J. U. POWELL.

APOLLONIUS AGAIN.

i 8. *δηρὸν δ' οὐ μετέπειτα τεὴν κατὰ βάξιν Ἰήσων.*

This has been defended on the supposition that *τεὴν* refers to Apollo, but I agree with Mr Seaton in thinking this impossible. "The objection to *τεὴν* appears to be that the ancient poets, after the invocation is over, do not recur to it" (*Cl. Rev.* 1903, p. 69). Merkel's *ἐτεὴν* is highly improbable, because the only oblique case of the word known is the adverb *ἐτεῇ*. Mr Mooney has successfully restored *ἐτεῇ* for *αἰτεῖ* at ii 1179; should we not restore it here also? "And not long thereafter in very truth came Jason according to the oracle."

ἐτεῇ was a rare word and liable to corruption; so the *ἐτεῇ* of Democritus was corrupted to *αἰτίῃ* in Diog. Laert. ix 72.

i 82. *ὡς οὐκ ἀνθρώποισι κακὸν μήκιστον ἐπαυρεῖν.*

The meaning required is "no evil is too remote for men to meet with," but it is not easy to get this out of the Greek. The only way I can construe it is: "no evil can be counted most distant for men to meet with," i.e. "however remote a contingency you can imagine, it is possible that a yet more remote one may arise." This is proved by the fate of Canthus and Mopsus, who went on a dangerous errand to Colchis, and yet perished not there, but at the most distant place from it that can be thought of.

Something like this is ii 524, *οὐδέ τις αἶα τηλουρός*, "no land is distant to a man's imagination."

i 272. *ἀλλ' ὑπὸ μητρυιῇ βίοτον βαρὺν ἡγηλάζει·*
καί ἑ νέον πολέεσσιν ὀνείδεσιν ἐστυφέλιξεν,
τῇ δέ τ' ὀδυρομένῃ δέδεται κέαρ ἔνδοθεν ἄτῃ.

If *ἐστυφέλιξεν* were a gnomic aorist, *νέον* would be unconstruable. The meaning is "and she has just overwhelmed

her with reproaches." Köchly's ἥ ἑ for καί ἑ is certainly the natural epic idiom, ἡ being not relative but demonstrative. I do not know what Merkel means by saying "καὶ est B 361." As we are changing the subject in 273 we should expect some other connexion than καὶ in Apollonius, who is very particular in such matters and does not in the least follow the Homeric licence about changing the subject without any warning.

Look at the very first simile in Homer, B 87: ἠύτε ἔθνεα εἶσι μελισσάων.....αἱ μέν τ' ἔνθα ἄλις πεποτήαται αἱ δέ τε ἔνθα. So here we should expect ἡ μὲν νέον...τῇ δέ τε. And of course the μὲν might be suppressed.

i 517. ἡ θέμις.

It has been much disputed whether we should read ἥ or ᾗ in such phrases in Homer. Modern editors of Apollonius seem always to read ἡ. The MSS. can hardly be quoted seriously on such a point; if any one does appeal to them he will soon think better of it, for L reads ᾗ at i 517, 692, ἡ at i 960, iv 1129, and ἤπερ ἐῴκει at iii 189! G has ᾗ at i 517, 960, 1061, ii 840, iii 189, 991, 1062, iv 479, 1129. Though G often enough drops the iota subscript, still this constant habit with ᾗ seems to denote a deliberate theory that ᾗ was the right form. For such a theory no support is to be found in Ebeling, who does however mention one to the effect that ἥ is "an adverb like νὴ μὴ φή." Nor is G supported by the superior authority of L. So far as the evidence of these two MSS. does go, L is for ἡ in the main and G may be said to point rather to ᾗ. And I suppose we may neglect the theory that ἡ was an adverb.

We must consider the passages in the *Argonautica* on their own merits, when it will appear that they may be divided into three groups.

(1) ᾗ clearly right: i 692 αὕτως ᾗ θέμις ἐστί, iii 991 ᾗ θέμις, ὡς ἐπέοικε. Here there can hardly be a doubt, and ᾗ is surely better also at i 959 ἱδρύσαντο ἱερόν, ᾗ θέμις ἦεν, 1060 ἐπειρήσαντό τ' ἀέθλων, ᾗ θέμις. This ᾗ is also very strongly supported by iii 189 ᾗπερ ἐῴκει, 1062 ᾗ φίλον, ᾗ τοι ἔαδεν, where by the way ᾗ τοι, not εἴ τοι, is apparently right; cp. the

repeated πῃ directly after in 1071, 1072 and other repetitions of the kind[1].

(2) ἥ clearly right: iv 684 *ἥ τε δίκη λυγροῖς ἱκέτῃσι τέτυκται*, though ἧ is not impossible there. But ἥ is supported by two places where ἥ is indisputable as a demonstrative: ii 800 *ἥ γὰρ θέμις*, iii 209 *ἥ γάρ τε δίκη θεσμοῖο τέτυκται*.

(3) Doubtful: i 517, ii 840, iv 1129. In these three Brunck reads ἧ, rightly I think upon the whole.

And now the reader will be surprised to hear that all these passages are correctly printed by Brunck. Merkel is responsible for introducing ἥ where Brunck had sense enough to see that ἧ was required. Either Merkel simply followed L with a difference, or else argued that ἥ was right in Homer, and therefore in Apollonius. But nobody knows what view Ap. took of the question as concerning the text of Homer, and he varies from Homer in all sorts of ways. Of course he could use sometimes the one and sometimes the other as he pleased, but if we are to force uniformity upon him, what I have said shews abundantly that we shall have to read ἧ wherever the relative is used.

We can however draw a conclusion from this about the Homeric use. If ἧ is so often required in Apollonius, why is it never required by the sense in Homer? Why is ἥ always sufficient in him? If he had meant ἧ some passage or other would have shewn his meaning, as in Ap. i 692. It may be inferred therefore that in Homer ἥ is always the true reading.

i 671. *παρθενικαὶ...λευκῇσιν ἐπιχνοάουσαι ἐθείραις*. Miss Lorimer has called my attention to Eur. *Hel.* 283, *πολιὰ παρθενεύεται*, a phrase which goes a long way to supporting the text, and is the only good parallel yet adduced.

i 689. *ἦ μὲν ἐγών, εἰ καί με τὰ νῦν ἔτι πεφρίκασιν*
Κῆρες, ἐπερχόμενόν που ὀίομαι εἰς ἔτος ἤδη
γαῖαν ἐφέσσεσθαι, κτερέων ἀπὸ μοῖραν ἑλοῦσαν.

It is really astonishing how long the most glaring bad grammar will escape one's notice. *ἑλοῦσαν* refers to the subject

[1] ἤ *τοι* however, the reading of L etc., has now the strong support of Ox. Pap. 1243.

of *οἴομαι* and therefore is a corruption of *ἑλοῦσα*, and I never saw it till now!

ii 506. *ἔνθα δ' Ἀρισταῖον Φοίβῳ τέκεν, ὃν καλέουσιν*
Ἀγρέα καὶ Νόμιον πολυλήιοι Αἱμονίηες.
τὴν μὲν γὰρ φιλότητι θεὸς ποιήσατο νύμφην
αὐτοῦ μακραίωνα καὶ ἀγρότιν· υἷα δ' ἔνεικεν
νηπίαχον Χείρωνος ὑπ' ἄντροισιν κομέεσθαι.

The connexion of this passage is pretty clear if only we pay heed to *μὲν* and *δέ*. Ap. is explaining the curious fact that Aristaeus is specially connected with Haemonia, and yet he was born in Libya and his mother is one of the Libyan "earth-nymphs," *χθονίη νύμφη*. "In Libya she bore Aristaeus, whom the Haemonians call Agreus and Nomius, for though the god made her a nymph *αὐτοῦ*, there in Libya, still he brought his son back to be bred up in the cave of Chiron," and so the apparent discrepancy is explained.

The mention of Sirius in 517, 524 in connexion with Aristaeus may be illustrated from Callimachus *Aitia* 35 (Oxyrh. Pap. 1011):

πρηΰνειν χαλεπὴν Μαῖραν ἀνερχομένην.

Aristaeus is a bee hero and Sirius is specially connected with bees. Pliny *Hist. Nat.* xi 12, venit hoc (mel) ex aere et maxime siderum exortu, praecipueque ipso Sirio exsplendescente fit. xi 14, alterum genus est mellis aestivi, quod ideo vocatur *ὡραῖον*, a tempestivitate praecipua, ipso Sirio exsplendescente post solstitium diebus tricenis fere. See Mr Ticknor Edwardes' quaint romance *The Honey Star*, to which I owe the reference to Pliny. Virgil *Georg.* iv 425.

ii 972 *τῷ δ' οὔτις ποταμῶν ἐναλίγκιος, οὐδὲ ῥέεθρα*
τόσσ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἵησι παρὲξ ἔθεν ἄνδιχα βάλλων.
τετράκις εἰς ἑκατὸν δεύοιτό κεν εἴ τις ἕκαστα
975 *πεμπάζοι, μία δ' οἵη ἐτήτυμος ἔπλετο πηγή.*
ἡ μέν τ' ἐξ ὀρέων κατανίσσεται ἤπειρόνδε
ὑψηλῶν, ἃ τέ φασιν Ἀμαζόνια κλείεσθαι,
ἔνθεν δ' αἰπυτέρην ἐπικίδναται ἔνδοθι γαῖαν
ἀντικρύ· τῶ καί οἱ ἐπίστροφοί εἰσι κέλευθοι,

980 *αἰεὶ δ' ἄλλυδις ἄλλη, ὅπῃ κύρσειε μάλιστα*
ἠπείρου χθαμαλῆς, εἰλίσσεται, ἡ μὲν ἄπωθεν
ἡ δὲ πέλας· πολέες δὲ πόροι νώνυμνοι ἔασιν
ὅππῃ ὑπεξαφύονται, ὁ δ' ἀμφαδὸν ἄμμιγα παύροις
Πόντον ἐς Ἄξεινον κυρτὴν ὑπερεύγεται ἄκρην.

This passage appears to need explanation, for those which I have looked at are very unsatisfactory. The river is the Thermodon, which is like no other because it splits up into such a multitude of streams. There are no less than ninety-six of them, but only one real source. The original river flows down from the high Amazonian range of mountains into a plain, *ἤπειρον*, a curious use of the word to which I know no parallel except ii 372, 399. Then the difficulties begin for both Thermodon and the translators. Manifestly the river cannot spread over higher ground, even though it is a river in Apollonius; *αἰπυτέρην ἐπικίδναται γαῖαν ἀντικρύ* can only mean one thing; after flowing across the plain, the water comes straight against a range of higher ground; *αἰπυτέρην* has its proper comparative force. In such a case, what can the river do? Either it forms a lake if all outlet is barred, or else it has to wander about till it finds a way through, and Thermodon contrives to find no less than ninety-six of them; *τῶ καί οἱ ἐπίστροφοί εἰσι κέλευθοι*, "therefore its streams have to twist about, and each of them flows where it can find low enough ground to get through the hills." Some have to go further for this purpose, others find a channel at once. Many of them *νώνυμνοι ἔασιν ὅππῃ ὑπεξαφύονται*; this is certainly hard to understand; Liddell and Scott say that *ὑπεξαφύονται* means "are lost in the sands," but there is not a word about sand in the context, nor is the scenery described, a plain rising into hills, one where streams would be so swallowed up. And *ὑπεξαφύω* can mean nothing except "draw off"; *οἶνον ἀφύσσω* does not mean "I swallow wine." Nor is it any sense to say that a stream is nameless where it is swallowed up. Again, what is *νώνυμνοι*? does it mean "nameless" at all? The two forms *νώνυμος* and *νώνυμνος* were thought by the ancients to be distinct, and it was a popular idea that the latter was

derived from *ὕμνος*. Ap. then perhaps means "they are not celebrated where they split off," and yet this does not seem much better, if at all. Possibly we should go further still; if we look at the way in which *νώνυμνος* is used by Homer, we shall be struck by its frequent combination with *ἀπολέσθαι*. M 70, N 227 (Ξ 70?), *νωνύμνους ἀπολέσθαι ἀπ' Ἀργεος ἐνθάδ' Ἀχαιούς*; ξ 182, *ὅπως ἀπὸ φῦλον ὄληται νώνυμον*. The last is the shorter form of the word no doubt, but anyhow Ap. knew of this connexion in at least three and perhaps four passages of Homer, for he may have known the doubtful line Ξ 70. When we consider the sort of colouring an obsolete word gets in old poetry from its context, and when we reflect on the absurd errors made about the meaning of words by the Alexandrines, is it too much to think that *νώνυμνοι ἔασιν ὅππῃ ὑπεξαφύονται* really is meant to suggest something like "perish where they leave the parent stream"? The consequence of this would be that only a few survive to reach the sea with the main river, as he goes on to say.

So after all these streams are swallowed up somehow, it appears, but Ap. does not tell us what happens to them; in fact he was describing a nonsensical business and knew it, and so gets out of the trouble perfunctorily. Such is too often his custom; why could he not avail himself of the freedom granted to poets and leave alone geographical problems which neither he nor any one else can make head or tail of?

I do not understand *ἔνδοθι* in 978. In 984 the MSS. are quite right; Ruhnken's *ἄχνην* for *ἄκρην* is a strange misapprehension on the part of a scholar from whom one is always loth to differ. See ii 371: *Θεμισκύρειον ὑπ' ἄκρην μύρεται*, spoken of the same river.

ii 1127. *ᾗ ἔνι τειρόμενοι ἅμ' ἐπὶ χρέος ἐμβεβαῶτες.*

πείρομεν οἶδμα Köchly. Why did Merkel want to spoil this by reading *πείρομεν οἶμον*? The following passages throw some light upon Apollonian usage in the matter. iv 838, *οἶμον ὁδεύειν* (cf. Tryph. 102); iii 388, iv 457, *οἶδμα περῆσαι*; iv 980, *πεῖρον ἁλὸς μέγα λαῖτμα*; ii 775, *πείρετε πλόον*; iv 496, *περάαν πλόον*. Evidently *πείρειν οἶδμα* goes together much

better than *πείρειν οἶμον*, and palaeographically there can be no question between them. Perhaps Merkel objected to the hiatus, and certainly there are only eleven other instances of hiatus in the weak caesura of the third foot in our poet: i 332, 543, 705, 714, 1176, ii 693, 955, iii 263, 492, 591, 738 (for I cannot include ii 1268, iii 409, 495), but are not these enough to defend it? We are bound then to accept *οἶδμα*.

But Köchly went further, and changed *ἐπὶ* to *κατά*. Well, he was quite right again; he knew far more about epic usage and Greek in general than Merkel did, who for all his industry and learning had but little feeling for Greek usage. What is *ἐπὶ χρέος*? What does it go with? It cannot go with *πείρομεν οἶδμα* or *οἶμον*, for nobody says *πλεῖν ἐπὶ χρέος* for to "sail on business"; still less can it go with *ἐμβεβαῶτες*, which simply means "being on board." If *χρέος* means merely "a thing" we can say *ἰέναι ἐπὶ χρέος*, "to go for a thing," but here of course the meaning is "on business" and that is *κατὰ χρέος*, and sure enough we have *κατὰ χρέος* in one sense or another at iii 189, iv 530, 889, *κατὰ χρειὼ* at i 660.

πειρομενοιαμακατα, however written, would not scan and was stupidly altered in consequence.

iii 80. *εἰ δὴ σεῖο λιλαιομένης ἀθερίζω*
ἢ ἔπος ἠέ τι ἔργον, ὅ κεν χέρες αἴγε κάμοιεν
ἠπεδαναί.

It is very difficult to feel any security about the use of *ὅδε*, *ὅγε* in epic verse, but *αἴγε* seems here to trespass the bounds of belief. Probably we should read *αἵδε*, for of course this confusion is very common.

iii 215. *ἔσταν δ' ἐν προμολῇσι τεθηπότες ἔρκε' ἄνακτος*
εὐρείας τε πύλας, καὶ κίονας οἳ περὶ τοίχους
ἐξείης ἄνεχον, θριγκὸς δ' ἐφύπερθε δόμοιο
λαΐνεος χαλκέῃσιν ἐπὶ γλυφίδεσσιν ἀρήρει.

Is *ἄνεχον* transitive or intransitive? Transitive, I think, for the statement that pillars stood all round the walls seems feeble and contrary to one's poetic feeling. If a poet says that "a pillar stands," he calls up the picture of a pillar like that of

Simeon Stylites, supporting nothing; now a row of such pillars here would be absurd. Again τοίχους means not the wall round the court, for that would be τεῖχος or τειχίον, but the wall of the palace itself. Ap. then is thinking of a sort of cloister in which a row of columns supports a wall rising above them, as in the Doge's Palace. Knowing his business as a painter in verse, he leads the eye upwards from the columns along the palace wall above them to the θριγκὸς at the top of the whole building. περὶ is adverbial.

So Tennyson describing the Palace of Art:

> And round the cool green courts there ran a row
> Of cloisters branched like mighty woods...
> And round the roofs a gilded gallery.

He leads the eye up in just the same way.

iii 248. τῇ μὲν ἄρ' οἵγε
ἐκ θαλάμου θάλαμόνδε κασιγνήτην μετιοῦσαν—
Ἥρη γάρ μεν ἔρυκε δόμῳ· πρὶν δ' οὔτι θάμιζεν
ἐν μεγάροις, Ἑκάτης δὲ πανήμερος ἀμφεπονεῖτο
νηόν, ἐπεί ῥα θεᾶς αὐτὴ πέλεν ἀρήτειρα—
καί σφεας ὡς ἴδεν ἄσσον, ἀνίαχεν.

So LG, τὴν μὲν ἄρ' οἵγε...μετιοῦσαν or ἡ μὲν ἄρ' ἦει... μετιοῦσα inferior MSS. These are probably attempts at correction, at any rate they are quite worthless. "Emendatio, si qua opus est, non optime processit," says Merkel, quoting three monstrosities in that way. Surely all we want is τῇ μὲν ἄρ' ἦγε...μετιοῦσα. The anacoluthon, considering the three parenthetic lines, is extremely slight; Merkel (who reads τὴν μὲν ἄρ' οἵ γε...μετιοῦσαν) refers to two other places, iv 435, 852. Now in both those places Ap. begins with ἡ δὲ in the nominative, and they are closely parallel to my proposal, but they do not come anywhere near such a violent piece of grammar as τὴν οἵγε μετιοῦσαν καί σφεας ὡς ἴδεν ἀνίαχεν, which is surely impossible in such a poet as this and would astonish us even in Aeschylus.

I suppose that μετιοῦσαν was the first stage in the corruption, either by attraction to κασιγνήτην or by the irrational addition of ν at the end of a line of which I have spoken

before. *τῇ* was then altered by some MSS. to *τὴν* to agree with it. When or why *ἤγε* became *οἴγε* I will not guess, but I do not think that *ἦει* of some other MSS. is anything but an interpolation. I should add that Gerhard came very near the truth with *βῆ* (which however is impossible) *ἤγε μετιοῦσα*.

iii 287. *ἀντία δ' αἰεὶ*
βάλλεν ἐπ' Αἰσονίδην ἀμαρύγματα, καί οἱ ἄηντο
στηθέων ἐκ πυκιναὶ καμάτῳ φρένες.

ἐπ' G, *ὑπ'* L, which is nonsense, nor can any true parallel to it be quoted from Ap. *ἄηντο· πνοὴν ἔπεμπον ἢ μετεωρίζοντο*, says the scholiast—*ἄητο· ἐφέρετο* Hesych.; the former may be philologically right, but the latter is what Ap. meant. He misunderstood Homer's use of *ἄητο* in Φ 386 *δίχα θυμὸς ἄητο*, and supposed it to mean "jumped" or the like; so at iii 688, *περί μοι παίδων σέο θυμὸς ἄηται*, "my heart is agitated (?)." But at ii 81 he plainly connects it with *ἀίω*, *ἐπ' ἄλλῳ δ' ἄλλος ἄηται δοῦπος*, and so the scholiast says *ἐξηχεῖται, ἀκούεται*. Here (iii 288) the meaning is "her heart jumped into her mouth"; contrast iii 634: *μόλις δ' ἐσαγείρατο θυμὸν ὡς πάρος ἐν στέρνοις*.

There is nothing wonderful in his adventures with these words; before Aristarchus fancy ran riot on the Homeric vocabulary; *διὰ στήτην* (*sic*) in A 6 was supposed by some to mean "on account of a woman," and *μάστακα* in I 324 "a locust." Another word where I think I see Ap. speculating is *ἄκριτος*. Orpheus sang against the Sirens (iv 909):

παρθενικὴν δ' ἐνοπὴν ἐβιήσατο φόρμιγξ,
νῆα δ' ὁμοῦ ζέφυρός τε καὶ ἠχῆεν φέρε κῦμα
πρυμνόθεν ὀρνύμενον· ταὶ δ' ἄκριτον ἴεσαν αὐδήν.

Is it not very flat and pointless to say "they went on singing unceasingly"? Surely the context demands: "sang in vain," especially as the poet goes on with *ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥς*, "but in spite of this one of the Argonauts jumped overboard and swam off to them." To say that "they sang unceasingly, but in spite of this etc." is no connexion at all. And the meaning "in vain" exactly suits the use of the word at σ 124, τ 170, *πενθήμεναι ἄκριτον αἰεί*, though of course I do not intend

to say that Homer so meant it. In truth to this day we are in the dark about many such Homeric words, and the orthodox views which we accept and have come to believe in are not always infallible; I am not at all so sure that Ap. may not be right about *ἄκριτον* after all.

iii 891. *ὦ φίλαι, ἦ μέγα δή τι παρήλιτον, οὐδ' ἐνόησα*
μὴ ἴμεν ἀλλοδαποῖσι μετ' ἄνδρασιν, οἵ τ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν
ἡμετέρην στρωφῶσιν.

The hiatus in the first foot is of a kind unparalleled in Ap., the meaning is obscure, the construction of *ἴμεν μετ' ἄνδρασιν* is doubtful. But Merkel's *μήνιμ'* makes it all worse than ever; Samuelsson's *ἔμμεναι* is much better and is supported by i 779, *μετ' ἀλλοδάποισιν ἐόντος ἀνδράσι* (Mooney). Compare however also ii 870, *γαίῃ ἐν ἀλλοδαπῇ δὴν ἔμμεναι*; did not Ap. then here say *δὴν ἔμεν*? It is rather nearer than *ἔμμεναι* to *μὴ ἴμεν*, and Medea might well enough say: "I did not bethink me of being *all this time* among the strangers."

iii 932. *ἀκλειὴς ὅδε μάντις, ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα παῖδες ἴσασιν*
οἶδε νόῳ φράσσασθαι.

Because Callimachus said that Envy did not love a poet *ὃς οὐδ' ὅσα πόντος ἀείδει*, it is supposed that there must here be a reference to Callimachus. But nobody can explain intelligibly what the point of the reference may be, and where is the necessity for supposing any reference at all? Cannot two poets use the words *οὐδ' ὅσα* without being accused of imitating or parodying one another? To say that the crow who calls Mopsus *ἀκλειὴς μάντις* is Callimachus, and that Mopsus is Apollonius himself who only replies with a smile of disdain, is a theory which breaks down at once, because Mopsus takes the advice of the crow. Besides, the crow is the mouthpiece of Hera herself.

No doubt Callimachus was attacking Apollonius in what *he* said, but I altogether deny that Ap. is here answering him.

iv 208. *πρυμναῖα νεὼς ἄπο πείσματ' ἔκοψεν.*

We should think a good deal before altering *νεὼς* to *νεός*, although it is certainly true that Ap. does use *νεὸς* in i 1201.

I transcribe Schneider's note on Callimachus *Hymn.* iii 37 (vol. i, p. 209):

"Quum II 65 Callimachus *βαθύγειος* dixisset, nunc atticam formam *μεσόγεως* versui accommodavit non aliam ob causam nisi quod metro facilius constringebatur. idem fecit in forma item attica *νεώς* in frag. CX *ἐν στομάτεσσι νεὼς Ἀχεροντείης ἐπίβαθρον*, quod imitatus est Apoll. Rhod. IV 208 *σπασσάμενος πρυμναῖα νεὼς ἀπὸ πείσματ' ἔκοψεν*. nec desunt alia atticismi vestigia (ut fortasse etiam *μακράν* II 7), qualia prudens et sciens admisit Callimachus erravitque hac quoque in re Cobet. l. l. p. 420 seq." (l. l. is *Mnemosyne* vol. x.)

Atticism is a very fine thing in connexion with Attic writers, but it is a mistake to apply this engine reversed without discrimination to Alexandrines. At the same time I deplore Schneider's assumption that Ap. was imitating Callimachus. It is too ridiculous that these two authors can never say that two and two make four without being accused of imitating or criticizing one another. They both wrote *νεὼς* before a vowel because it was a form perfectly familiar to them and they did not care to use metrical ictus freely. Though a good many instances of it can be collected from Ap., still he obviously does not court it. If a papyrus should turn up with *νεὸς* in either passage, it will be another story; at present we are bound to adhere to the MSS.

νεὼς is also read in *Orph. Arg.* 442.

iv 259. *ἔστιν γὰρ πλόος ἄλλος, ὃν ἀθανάτων ἱερῆες*
πέφραδον, οἳ Θήβης Τριτωνίδος ἐκγεγάασιν.

Thebe must here be a goddess or nymph, daughter of Triton, from whom the priests of Egyptian Thebes are said to be descended. I do not see how *Θήβης ἐκγεγάασιν* can mean simply "are inhabitants of Thebes," or how it can mean less than "are descendants of Thebe[1]."

iv 270. *Διόθεν δέ μιν οὔποτε δεύει*
ὄμβρος ἅλις προχοῇσι δ' ἀνασταχύουσιν ἄρουραι.

The scholiast raises the question whether we should punc-

[1] "eine agyptische Nymphe, Nonn. 4, 304; 5, 86; 41, 270." Pape, *Eigennamen.* H. J.

tuate before or after ἅλις. The position of δὲ ought to settle it; Ap. hardly ever places it third in its sentence. I have only noted two instances, and even they are of no avail. i 756, σὺν τῷ δ' Οἰνόμαος, where σὺν τῷ is nothing like ἅλις προχοῇσι; iv 511, ὕστατον αὐτοὶ δ' αὖτε, where the reading is very doubtful; δεῖ γάρ τε *Et. Mag.* whence Merkel ὕστατον αὖ, δὴ γάρ τε.

For position of ἅλις see iv 656, ἱδρῶ ἅλις· χροιῇ δέ. In both places it means "in abundance," and though this is a very unnecessary addition to the words οὔποτε δεύει ὄμβρος, still there is no objection to it.

iv 336. ὣς δὲ καὶ εἰς ἀκτὰς πληθὺν λίπεν ἀγχόθι νήσους.

ἀκτὰς Vind., Vrat. in marg., ἀητὰς L, ἄλλας L corr., vulg. ἀκτὰς then is plainly the original, ἄλλας is only a desperate attempt to get sense, which fails ignominiously because all the "other islands" for which we have any room have just been mentioned. For νήσους Vrat. in marg. gives νήσων. It is not very probable that this is anything but a conjecture, if we consider the whole context. For 330 ends with ἀγχόθι νήσους, 333 with λίπον ἔνδοθι νήσους. To end 336 then with λίπεν (or λίπον; MSS. vary and both readings make sense) ἀγχόθι νήσων is altogether out of the question, and this cannot have been the original reading. Merkel is obviously right in saying: "verba postrema vitio satis vetusto, ut scriptura ἄλλας pro ἀκτὰς indicat, ex v. 333 aut 330 repetita." When however he goes on to suggest possibilities for supplying the last two feet of the line, he has omitted to observe that whatever he supplies must be wrong for the simple reason that the first four feet will not construe. λίπεν εἰς ἀκτὰς is not Greek for anything whatever, and it is clear that the whole phrase λίπεν ἀγχόθι νήσους has come in from above; all we can now do is to leave a lacuna after πληθύν.

iv 377. τῷ ἐπίσχετε τάσδ' ἀλεγεινὰς
ἄμφω συνθεσίας.

I can find no parallel to ἐπέχω or ἐπίσχω συνθεσίην. ἄμφω means Jason and Absyrtus, who are to submit their case to be tried by some impartial potentate. ὑπίσχετε?

ὑπίσχετε συνθεσίας then is poetical for ὑπίσχετε δίκην κατὰ συνθεσίην.

iv 485. Κόλχον δ' ὄλεκον στόλον.

Κόλχων G, vulg. I might well say Merkel had not too much feeling for Greek usage, but he knew that Κόλχον was in L, so out Κόλχων had to go. The adjectives of Κόλχος are Κολχικός, Κόλχις and Κολχηίς; Κόλχον στόλον is as bad as Ἰνδὸν χρυσὸν would be. No doubt in late or dubious Greek we may find such abominations, and so we may actually read Ἰνδὴν βήρυλλον in *Anth. Pal.* ix 544, Ἰταλὴν θυμέλην *ibid.* iv 290, and so on, but I should like some clear evidence against Apollonius before accusing him of such a crime.

iv 967. δῦνον, ἐπεί ῥ' ἀλόχοιο Διὸς πόρσυνον ἐφετμάς.

They dived into the sea since they *had* fulfilled the behest of Hera. The imperfect does not give the only sense possible; should we read πόρσυναν? The first aorist is used in the indicative passive by Aeschylus (*Pers.* 267, *Cho.* 990), participle active by Sophocles (*O. T.* 1476), and Hesychius has πορσῦναι: for the indicative active I can only quote *Orph. Arg.* 1305.

A scholion on Homer μ 453 is quoted by Merkel on page clxxv of his prolegomena. ἀριζήλως] ἀριδήλως. οὐ γὰρ ἐκτέταται ὁ ζῆλος. Merkel suggests ἔγκειται for ἐκτέταται, but clearly ἐκτέταται means "is lengthened," and we should read ἐκτέταται τὸ ῑ. The scholiast meant to say that "ἀριζήλως is a poetic form for ἀριδήλως, which we cannot read as some wish to do, because the ῑ is not lengthened before δ." When τὸ ῑ had been lost after ἐκτέταται, thereupon ὁ ζῆλος was wrongly added, or else there is a considerable lacuna before ὁ ζῆλος.

ARTHUR PLATT.

P.S.—Aeschylus uses νώνυμοι in the sense I assume above (p. 134). βεβᾶσιν, οἵ, νώνυμοι, "they are gone to destruction," *Pers.* 1003.

Th. ii 149.

κεἶπέ μοι ἄλλα τε πολλὰ καὶ ὡς ἄρα Δέλφις ἔραται.

Apart from the quantity of *ἔραται* or *ἐρᾶται*, it seems to me that we want a genitive with it; qu. *ἐρᾷ τευ*? At i 78 the form *ἔρασσαι* appears easier to understand, *σ* being doubled on false Homeric analogy.

ἐρᾶται could hardly be used in active sense by Theocritus, *ὁ ἐρώμενος* is common enough and nobody would ever use it for *ὁ ἐρῶν*; so *ἐρᾶται* could only mean "he is loved." It is no use for Hiller to quote Constantine's Anacreontics.

Th. viii 55.

ἀλλ' ὑπὸ τᾷ πέτρᾳ τᾷδ' ᾄσομαι ἀγκὰς ἔχων τυ,
σύννομα μᾶλ' ἐσορῶν τὰν Σικελὰν ἐς ἅλα.

Most critics are agreed that the quatrain of which these are the last two lines is to be assigned to Daphnis, not to Menalcas. If so the correction *σύννομε κάλ'* cannot be right because of the gender; it is Menalcas who praises Milo, Daphnis is throughout *γυναικοφίλας*. But 56 as it stands is unconstruable; Fritzsche indeed gets grammar out of it by taking *ᾄσομαι ἐς ἅλα* together, but "sing into the sea"—! Besides compare xi 18, *ἐς πόντον ὁρῶν ἄειδε*. All that is necessary is to read *Σικελάν τ' ἐς ἅλα*.

But K and some other MSS. read *τὰν Σικελικὰν*; it is clear enough that *τὰν Σικελὰν* is only a correction of this, and I much doubt whether it be the right one. The first syllable of *Σικελικὸς* is certainly lengthened by late poets and the lengthening may well have begun before Theocritus; in fact

he himself has *Σικελίδαν* as a choriambus at vii 40. I would much prefer then to read *Σικελικάν τ' ἐς ἄλα.*

As Daphnis sits under the shelter of a rock he is presumably some way back from the cliff; he looks down a sloping green upon his sheep feeding together and beyond them the Sicilian sea, and the whole makes a beautiful picture. *ὑπὸ πέτρᾳ* certainly does not mean "under the cliff"; when the Cyclops was melancholy and had found no remedy for his pain he mooned about under the cliff *ἐπ' ἀιόνος*, but when he *εὗρε τὸ φάρμακον* he sat on the top of the cliff singing and looking out to sea (vii 14—18).

Th. xiii 68.

ναῦς μὲν ἄρμεν' ἔχοισα μετάρσια τῶν παρεόντων
ἱστία δ' ἡμίθεοι μεσονύκτιον ἐξεκάθαιρον
Ἡρακλῆα μένοντες.

μετάρσια must refer to the ship and therefore Graefius' *μεταρσία* is right; nobody ever heard of *ἱστία μετέωρα* whereas *ναῦς μετέωρος* is common. *ἄρμενα* and *ἱστία* mean too much the same thing and one or other must be wrong; Reiske proposed *ἴκρια* for *ἱστία*, but the presumption certainly is that *ἄρμενα* is the word to alter, both because of the scansion which shews corruption to be in that neighbourhood and because *ἄρμεν' ἔχοισα* is so feeble without *μετάρσια*. What we want with *μεταρσία* is something like *ὁρμοῦσα*; read then *ναῦς μὲν ἄρ' ὅρμον ἔχοισα*. The reading of Callierges, *ναῦς μένεν*, can hardly be right, since *μένοντες* comes in 70.

The verb must have followed *μεταρσία*; *τῶν παρεόντων* is evidently a desperate attempt to get some Greek words, no matter what, out of a chaotic original. The end was perhaps *πόντῳ*; *ἔνπρεπε πόντῳ*, "was to be seen on the sea," might give rise possibly to the text. 69 seems to me right as it stands; the heroes would occupy themselves with doing something, and to clean the sails is a sensible thing enough.

Th. xvi 71.

οὔπω μῆνας ἄγων ἕκαμ' οὐρανὸς οὐδ' ἐνιαυτούς·
πολλοὶ κινήσουσιν ἔτι τροχὸν ἅματος ἵπποι·
ἔσσεται οὗτος ἀνήρ, ὃς ἐμεῦ κεχρήσετ' ἀοιδοῦ.

ἄματος Wilamowitz for ἅρματος. What led me to see the truth about these lines was a feeling that οὐδ' ἐνιαυτοὺς is wrong somehow as it stands, but what definitely proves correction to be needed is the absurd πολλοὶ ἵπποι. The steeds of day are immortal, "many horses" of the sun is pure nonsense. Read:

οὔπω μῆνας ἄγων ἕκαμ' οὐρανὸς, οὐδ' ἐνιαυτοὺς
πολλοὺς κινήσουσιν ἔτι τροχὸν ἅματος ἵπποι·

and the meaning is: "Time is not yet played out, nor shall the sun traverse the sky for many years to come before a man will arise to need my praise." It is clear that the poet must have meant to say that Hiero would do great deeds *before long*, and therefore the οὐδὲ must go with the second of these lines. As they stand he only prophesies that time will go on for a long time, and at some *far-distant* date, you would suppose, a man will appear. It is very probable too that Theocritus had in mind Sophocles *Ant.* 1064:

ἀλλ' εὖ γέ τοι κάτισθι μὴ πολλοὺς ἔτι
τρόχους ἁμιλλητῆρας ἡλίου τελῶν

(τρόχους Erfurdt, τροχοὺς MSS., and τροχοὺς may have been the reading of Theocritus likely enough). The resemblance of the two passages to one another is at any rate very close.

Th. xvii 28.

τῶ καὶ ἐπεὶ δαίτηθεν ἴοι κεκορημένος ἤδη
...τῷ μὲν τόξον ἔδωκεν...οἱ δὲ...ἄγουσι.

"ἴῃ Call." Ahrens, and ἴῃ is the right reading, for ἔδωκε is a gnomic aorist as is shewn by the whole context. At *Odyssey* v 490 there is an ancient variation between αὔοι and αὔῃ after a gnomic aorist, but there can be no doubt that αὔῃ is there right, and there is no authority for an optative in such a consecution anywhere else in the *Bucolica*.

Th. xvii 44.

ῥηίδιοι δὲ γοναὶ, τέκνα δ' οὐ ποτεοικότα πατρί.

ῥηίδιοι is unintelligible. Read probably ἀλιθίαι. The Alexandrines held that ἤλιθα had two meanings, "abundantly"

and "idly" or "at random." Apollonius ii 283, *ἐπέχραον ἤλιθα χερσὶν*, Hesychius, *οἱ δὲ μάτην, εἰκῇ*. So the adjective meant "vain," "random" = *εἰκαῖος*. Theocr. xvi 9, *ἀλιθίην ὁδὸν* (=Homer's *τηυσίην ὁδὸν*) and there it is corrupted to *ἀλλοτρίην* in Φ. *ἠλίθιοι, ἠλίδιοι, ῥηίδιοι* are easy stages.

Th. xxi 58.

καὶ τὸν μὲν πιστεύσασα καλά γε τὸν ἠπήρατον.

Hermann's *ἀπειρώταν* has met with much favour, but I cannot see the sense of talking of this golden fish as a "land fish," nor can any one suggest a rational context for it. The meaning certainly cannot be "when I had drawn the fish to land," because the fisherman has already taken him off the hook. It seems to me obvious rather that *ἠπήρατον* is a corruption of *ἀσπαίροντα*, and that the meaning was "when I had laid him panting on the ground" or something of that kind. E.g. *καὶ τὸν ἐπεί γ' ἐτάνυσσα κατὰ χθονὸς ἀσπαίροντα* is the sort of thing that would make sense, but I despair of the actual words.

Th. xxiv 15.

ὦρσεν ἐπὶ πλατὺν οὐδόν, ὅθι σταθμὰ κοίλα θυράων
οἴκου, ἀπειλήσασα φαγεῖν βρέφος Ἡρακλῆα.

Fritzsche follows Paley in ejecting 16, partly because *οἴκου* is so feeble, partly because he does not understand *ἀπειλήσασα* and does not like *φαγεῖν*. *ἀπειλέω* in Homer means both "vow" and "boast," here and at Apoll. Rhod. iii 607 it means "order"; like other verbs of speaking it can be used very freely. *φαγεῖν* cannot be reasonably objected to. For *οἴκου* Stadtmüller proposes *εἶκεν*; Hera surely opened the doors miraculously, and it is rather absurd to suppose that they "yielded" before the battering snouts of the serpents: also the aorist is required rather than the imperfect. On these grounds I would rather read *οἶξεν*, or anyhow *οἶγεν* is as near as *εἶκεν*. I take the meaning to be "opened the posts of the doors so as to make a hollow space," *σταθμὰ θυράων* being only a poetical expansion of *θύρας*.

Th. xxiv 125.

δούρατι δὲ προβολαίῳ, ὑπ' ἀσπίδι νῶτον ἔχοντα,
ἀνδρὸς ὀρέξασθαι.

Ahrens thought *νῶτον* corrupt, and I cannot make anything of it. The Greek warrior certainly did not shift his shield on to his back when he lunged with his spear; Lynceus at xxii 184 advances

σείων καρτερὸν ἔγχος ὑπ' ἀσπίδος ἄντυγα πρώτην;

the Homeric heroes always hold the shield in front and lunge round it; qu. *ὑπασπίδιον προέχοντα*? or *ὑπ' ἀσπίδος ἄντυγ'* here also?

Th. xxv 162.

ξεῖνε πάλαι τινὰ πάγχυ σέθεν πέρι μῦθον ἀκούσας,
εἰ περὶ σεῦ, σφετέρῃσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ βάλλομαι ἄρτι.
ἦλυθε γὰρ στείχων τις ἀπ' Ἄργεος ὡς μέσος ἀκμῆς
ἐνθάδ' Ἀχαιὸς ἀνὴρ Ἑλίκης ἐξ ἀγχιάλοιο,
ὃς δή τοι μυθεῖτο καὶ ἐν πλεόνεσσιν Ἐπειῶν
οὔνεκεν Ἀργείων τις ἔθεν παρεόντος ὄλεσσε
θηρίον, αἰνολέοντα.

It is with the last half of 164 that I propose to deal. The following points are to be noted. (1) *ἀπ' Ἄργεος* cannot be right; it was an Achaean from Helice, which is of course in Achaea, not Argos, who came and told Phyleus of the slaying of the Nemean lion. Doubtless it is possible to come from Argos through Helice to Elis, but surely no poet would ever say that there "came an Achaean from Helice from Argos" or anything of this kind. Besides the man came to Helice from Nemea, for it was in his presence that the lion was killed. (2) *ὡς μέσος ἀκμῆς* is explained by some commentators to mean "about at the middle of his prime," but this is impossible, nor can any parallel to it be adduced. We can say, as Herodotus does, that an island is *μέση τῆς θαλάσσης*; we might say that a particular *ἐνιαυτὸς* was *μέσος* "della nostra vita"; that a man is *μέσος τῆς ἀκμῆς* we cannot say. An island really is in the middle of the sea, a year really is in the middle of our mortal span, and a man might be in the middle

of the sea, or might be said to be *μέσος τῶν ἑταίρων*, but he cannot be *μέσος τοῦ βίου*. The mid point of life is not the man but a point of time. Nor does the variant *ὡς νέος ἀκμὴν* help us. And how irrelevant and futile to tell us what the man's age was! (3) It was "quite a long time ago" that he came; this need not in poetical language mean more than a month or two. But clearly if you begin by saying "I heard of you long ago" and then go on "for a man came," we expect rather to be told when he came. Wilamowitz then is right in saying "dictum erat, quando ille venisset," though he does not suspect *ἀπ' Ἄργεος*.

When then did he come? Presumably directly after the slaying of the lion. And when was that? There has been much disputing over the time of year at which the Nemean games were held, but the only really relevant statement about it is that of the scholiast on Pindar, who says they were celebrated in the month Panemus "which is July." Perhaps I may add another proof of this; the games were instituted in connexion with the lion according to one story, with the death of Archemorus according to another. Both these mythical events must have been alleged to have happened at the same time of year at which the games were held, and if we can date any one of the three we date thereby the other two also. Now Archemorus died at the summer solstice (Statius *Theb.* iv 690) and the first celebration of the games was at his obsequies. Therefore it was in the height of summer, *ὅπως θέρος ἄκμασε μέσσον*; and that or something similar to that is what Theocritus said. *ὅτ' ἄρ θέρος ἦν μέσον ἀκμὴν* is pretty near the text; for *ἀκμὴν* cf. iv 60; "when it was still mid-summer."

Th. xxv 216.

ἤματος ἦν τὸ μεσηγύ, καὶ οὐδ' ὅπῃ ἴχνια τοῖο
φρασθῆναι δυνάμην.

οὐδ' ὅπῃ Π, *οὐδενὸς* Φ, *τοῖο* Π, *τοῖα* Φ. If all the MSS. had *οὐδ' ὅπῃ* one might manage to swallow it; indeed Meineke and others do; but where then does *οὐδενὸς* come from? We cannot say that it is an irrational attraction to *τοῖο* because Φ does not read *τοῖο*. I believe that *οὐδενὸς* is an easy enough corruption

of *οὐδ' ὅσον*, a common Alexandrine use; it is absurdly corrupted by cod. Guelf. at Apoll. Rh. ii 181; and that *οὐδ' ὅπῃ* is an attempt at correcting this.

οὐδ' ὅπῃ itself will hardly do, for the meaning then could only be "I could not see where his spoor was," which is a thing no poet would say when he meant simply "I could not see his spoor," and the order of words is bad besides. Very similar is the confusion caused by the reading *ὅπου* for *ὅτου*, which used to be the vulgate in Soph. *Ajax* 33.

Th. xxv 270.

μέχρι οἱ ἐξετάνυσσα βραχίονας ὀρθὸν ἀείρας
ἄπνευστον.

"*βραχίονας* Iunt.: *βραχίονος* DC: *-ονα* Φ Call." Wilamowitz. There is thus, it seems, no real authority for *βραχίονας*, and there are serious objections to it. Heracles has got upon the lion from behind, embracing him round the neck; he then throttles him until he dies of strangulation, *ἄπνευστον*. Reading *βραχίονας* we get instead of that the portentous picture of a man at one and the same moment embracing the lion's neck and stretching out his fore-legs; try the experiment on any good-sized lion. Secondly the use of *βραχίονας* as applied to an animal is strange; it seems not to occur anywhere else except in one passage of Aristotle. *βραχίοσιν* would be a better correction of the MSS., and for *οἱ* read *καὶ*. "Until I actually stretched him out dead, raising him in my arms," for the natural thing to do would be to lift up the body and throw it down as soon as he felt it to be dead.

Th. xxvi 4.

κισσόν τε ζώοντα καὶ ἀσφόδελον τὸν ὑπὲρ γᾶς.

Commentators are strange folk; "*ζώοντα, vivaces hederas*," says Fritzsche, "wie Sen. Oed. 455 sagt." Fritzsche knew as well as you or I do that *ζώων* does not mean *vivax*. We can put it straight by changing one letter, *κισσὸν ἀὲ ζώοντα*, "ivy never sere"; Aeschylus spoke twice of *ἀείζως πόα* in *Glaucus Pontius*.

But I am not particular about a letter or two myself, and

doubt whether Theocritus would have used the form *ἀὲ* at all. *κισσὸν ἀείζωόν τε* commends itself to me a little more than *κισσὸν ἀεὶ ζώοντα* (not "ivy and house-leek" but "and evergreen ivy").

Bion i 61.

καλὸς ἐὼν τοσσοῦτον ἐμήναο θηρὶ παλαίειν;

Koechly saw that something was wrong in this, and proposed *τί τοσοῦτον*, which is accepted by Ahrens. *τοσσούτῳ* seems to me much more likely, marking an antithesis between the beauty of Adonis and the monstrosity of the beast.

Bion i 72.

κάτθεό νιν μαλακοῖς ἐνὶ φάρεσιν οἷς ἐνίανεν,
οἷς μετὰ τεῦς ἀνὰ νύκτα τὸν ἱερὸν ὕπνον ἐμόχθει
παγχρυσέῳ κλιντῆρι· ποθεῖ καὶ στυγνὸν Ἄδωνιν.
βάλλε δέ νιν στεφάνοισι καὶ ἄνθεσι.

Various minutiae have here been contributed by various scholars; *ποθεῖ* remains unexplained and inexplicable. The lines are addressed to Aphrodite, *κάτθεο, τεῦς, βάλλε*; how can *ποθεῖ* fit in among them? Who or what yearns after dead Adonis? The bed indeed! It is plain that what *we* yearn after is another imperative; read therefore *πόθες καὶ στυγνὸν Ἄδωνιν*, "receive him to thy couch even in death." The middle is doubtless commoner in this sense, but *ποθοῦ* is not necessary.

Moschus i 6.

ἔστι δ' ὁ παῖς περίσαμος· ἐν εἴκοσι πᾶσι μάθοις νιν.

It may be my stupidity, but I cannot conceive what *ἐν εἴκοσι πᾶσι* is supposed to mean[1]; then too the Doric form is *εἴκατι*. The old reading *περίσαμος ἐν εἰκόσι* seems to me excellent; it is a way of saying that he is more beautiful than

[1] When Rostand makes his Samaritaine say:

On le reconnaîtrait entre mille à son calme
Et c'est Celui que j'attendais,

that is worthy of the exquisite poem in which it is embedded. But to substitute twenty for a thousand would be ridiculous, and to add "tous" would reduce the ridiculous to utter chaos. Heinsius at any rate gets rid of that with his *παισί*.

even statues. Then for *μάθοις νιν* we have as variants *μάθεις νιν, μάθης νιν, μάθοιο.* I believe that the original was *πᾶς κε μάθοι νιν*: cf. Th. vii 13, *οὐδέ κε τίς νιν | ἠγνοίησεν ἰδὼν.*

Moschus ii 58.

> *τοῖο δὲ φοινήεντος ἀφ' αἵματος ἐξανέτελλεν*
> *ὄρνις ἀγαλλόμενος πτερύγων πολυανθέι χροιῇ,*
> *ταρσὸν ἀναπλώσας, ὡσεί τέ τις ὠκύαλος νηῦς*
> *χρυσείου ταλάροιο περίσκεπε χείλεα ταρσοῖς.*

The edge of the basket of Europa is adorned with a peacock springing from the blood of Argus and spreading his tail. Two things are plainly wrong; first, the repetition of *ταρσὸν, ταρσοῖς*, both with reference to the peacock; secondly the statement that the bird covered the rim of the basket "like a swift ship"; and one might add that *ὡσεί τε* ought not to mean "*and* as" but simply "*as*," for *ὡσεί τε* constantly go together as one word like *ὥστε*. I conclude then that *ταρσὸν* ought to refer to the ship, that *ὡς νηῦς* must not go with *περίσκεπε*, and that the two verbs can hardly both be right.

Read *ἐξανατέλλων ... ταρσὸν ἀναπλώσασ' ὡσεί τέ τις ὠκύαλος νηῦς* and everything is smooth. *ταρσὸν* is the sails here, not the oars.

Mosch. ii 82.

> *οὐδ' οἷος ποίμνης ἐπιβόσκεται, οὐδὲ μὲν οἷος*
> *ὅστις ὑποδμηθεὶς ἐρύει πολύφορτον ἀπήνην.*

The elegance of *οἷος ὅστις* is remarkable, and one's suspicion of it is increased by considering the construction of *ὑποδμηθεὶς*. Do you not feel that it wants a dative with it very badly in this context? "Being tamed" is so bald a comment by itself. Read *μάστι* for *ὅστις*.

Th. ii 163, *τράπε*? Cf. *ἔτραχον* in 147. xxiii 36, *ἀρταμένον* as in 54.

εἰς νέκρον Ἄδωνιν 32, for *καί μευ κατασίναζε* qu. *καὶ μηκέτι στέναζε*?

ARTHUR PLATT.

NOTES ON ARISTOTLE, METAPHYSICS A 6.

(1) 987 b 7–10 *οὕτως μὲν οὖν τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν ὄντων ἰδέας προσηγόρευσε, τὰ δ' αἰσθητὰ παρὰ ταῦτα καὶ κατὰ ταῦτα λέγεσθαι πάντα· κατὰ μέθεξιν γὰρ εἶναι τὰ πολλὰ τῶν συνωνύμων τοῖς εἴδεσιν.*

So edd. with Alex., Ab; E and the other MSS. *συνωνύμων ὁμώνυμα τοῖς.*

Eject *τοῖς εἴδεσιν* as a gloss. As the text stands *τῶν συνωνύμων* has to be construed as a genitive defining *τὰ πολλὰ* (Bonitz, Comm., p. 90), which is intolerably harsh. If the words are omitted, a simple meaning is obtained, viz. "The 'many' exist by participation in the (Ideas) of the same name." For the position of the genitive in the sentence, compare E. N. vi. 1142 b 16 *ἀλλ' ὀρθότης τίς ἐστιν ἡ εὐβουλία βουλῆς.*

A genitive after *κατὰ μέθεξιν* is required by the sense: the whole phrase *κατὰ μέθεξιν εἶναι τῶν συνωνύμων* is the explanation of *κατὰ ταῦτα λέγεσθαι* above. *Λέγεσθαι* implies that the *πολλά* derive their *names* from the corresponding Ideas; the explanatory clause states that they derive their names, because they derive their *being*, from the Ideas of the same name. The whole passage is excessively condensed, and the sentence as thus emended puts no greater strain on the attention of the reader than its neighbours do. It cannot be said that it is more in Aristotle's manner to speak of the particulars as being of the same name as the Ideas than to speak of the Ideas as of the same name as the particulars: see Metaph. A 9, 990 b 6 *καθ' ἕκαστον γὰρ ὁμώνυμόν τί ἐστι καὶ παρὰ τὰς οὐσίας τῶν τε ἄλλων, ὧν ἐστὶν ἓν ἐπὶ πολλῶν.* I 10, 1059 a 13 *καίτοι τῷ εἴδει ταὐτὰ λέγεται εἶναι τὰ εἴδη τοῖς τισὶ καὶ οὐχ*

ὁμώνυμα, and compare de Lin. Insec. 968 a 9 ἔτι εἰ ἔστιν ἰδέα γραμμῆς, ἡ δ' ἰδέα πρώτη τῶν συνωνύμων.

(2) 987 b 10–14 τὴν δὲ μέθεξιν τοὔνομα μόνον μετέβαλεν· οἱ μὲν γὰρ Πυθαγόρειοι μιμήσει τὰ ὄντα φασὶν εἶναι τῶν ἀριθμῶν, Πλάτων δὲ μεθέξει, τοὔνομα μόνον μεταβαλών. τὴν μέντοι γε μέθεξιν ἢ τὴν μίμησιν ἥτις ἂν εἴη τῶν εἰδῶν ἀφεῖσαν ἐν κοινῷ ζητεῖν.

The words τῶν εἰδῶν are to be ejected as a gloss. They are awkward in situation and inappropriate to the context. They cannot be construed with μίμησιν but only with μέθεξιν. Aristotle clearly intends to draw a sharp distinction between the Numbers of the Pythagoreans and the Forms of Plato, for he has just stated that Plato is responsible both for the thing he called a Form and for this use of the word "Form." Aristotle never uses the word εἶδος in his account of the Pythagoreans A 5, 985 b 23 sqq., and he never applies the name of Numbers to the Platonic Forms except in their relation to the superior principles of the One and the indeterminate Dyad from which they are derived. Here the context shows that he is thinking of the Pythagorean doctrine as μίμησις τῶν ἀριθμῶν and of the Platonic doctrine as μέθεξις τῶν εἰδῶν and is asserting that the μέθεξις factor of the one is derived from the μίμησις factor of the other: he has just explained that the Platonic Form has an origin independent of the Pythagorean Number. Hence τῶν εἰδῶν can only be connected with μέθεξιν; but such slipshod writing is out of keeping with the clear simple style of the chapter as a whole. Jackson's suggestion (Journal of Philology, vol. 10, p. 292) to transpose the words so as to follow μεθέξει in the preceding clause is unsatisfactory, as no reason can be given for the mistake of the copyist.

(3) 987 b 20–2 ὡς μὲν οὖν ὕλην τὸ μέγα καὶ τὸ μικρὸν εἶναι ἀρχάς, ὡς δ' οὐσίαν τὸ ἕν· ἐξ ἐκείνων γὰρ κατὰ μέθεξιν τοῦ ἑνὸς τὰ εἴδη εἶναι τοὺς ἀριθμούς.

Εἶναι τοὺς ἀριθμούς codd. Alex.: Asclepius has καὶ τοὺς ἀριθμούς in his text, but his comment is taken from Alexander,

with the omission of the sentence explaining that *τοὺς ἀριθμούς* is in apposition with *τὰ εἴδη*: so that we cannot be sure that our MSS. of Asclepius preserve what that commentator really read. Schwegler (vol. 2, p. 63) deletes *τούς*: Zeller *τὰ εἴδη*. Jackson (op. cit. p. 293) transposes so as to read *ὡς δ' οὐσίαν τὸ ἓν (καὶ τοὺς ἀριθμούς)... τὰ εἴδη εἶναι.*

Zeller is right in removing *τὰ εἴδη* as a gloss.

Schwegler's suggestion is impossible, because *ἐξ ἐκείνων εἶναι* must mean are derived from the *μέγα-μικρόν* as from their *ὕλη*, so that there can be no predicative *ἀριθμούς*.

To take *τοὺς ἀριθμούς* as in explanatory apposition to *τὰ εἴδη* seems to contravene the ordinary rules of Greek style. One or other of the phrases must go. The transposition suggested by Jackson is to be rejected on more than one ground: thus, (1) no special reasons can be given to account for a copyist's error; (2) it involves the insertion of a *καί*; (3) the transposition is motived by Jackson's peculiar theory about the doctrine of *εἰδητικοὶ ἀριθμοί*; and not only is that theory inacceptable, but the transposition is in contradiction with it; for he holds that the *ἀριθμοί* are *particulars*, whereas the sentence obviously explains the genesis of the Forms, and all references to the particulars are out of place.

If one of the phrases is to be rejected, it must be *τὰ εἴδη*: for:

(*a*) It is the most likely to have been inserted.

(*b*) *τοὺς ἀριθμούς* is the most expressive, because it shows that the *εἴδη* are *ἀριθμοί* in respect of their *origin*: the reader would fully understand that the ideal numbers were meant. The Forms are spoken of again lower down as numbers, and the most appropriate place for the substitution of the new term is in this sentence.

(*c*) The sentence without *τὰ εἴδη* is in exact keeping with the style of Aristotle in this book, the sentence without *τοὺς ἀριθμούς* is not. The word *εἶναι* occurs some 112 times in the book: 83 times in the middle of the clause, only 19 times at the end, and of these 7 are cases of phrases like *φασὶν εἶναι*, *ὑπελαβον εἶναι*, while 5 are very short clauses. On the other hand *ἐστίν* (or *εἰσίν*) is more frequently put at the end of the

clause: it occurs 80 times, of which 41 are final, 39 medial (but 12 of these seem to be of special type).

In conclusion I wish to draw attention to the fact that apart from these three cases, all including the same words, there are practically no textual difficulties in this chapter. The only disturbances of the clear and even flow of the writing are furnished by the same words three times over. In two of the cases the text can be preserved only at the cost of attributing to Aristotle forms of words which may be grammarians' possibilities, but are utterly foreign to the style of the writer, which in this chapter at least is as limpid grammatically as it could be. On the other hand it is extremely compressed and so specially liable to be glossed; and the words themselves are obviously such as would be most naturally added by a reader.

C. M. GILLESPIE.

THE UNIVERSITY, LEEDS.
April, 1915.

NOTE.—I am glad to have an opportunity of saying that I long ago repented of the transposition which Mr Gillespie criticizes; and that, nearly twenty years ago, in a paper read before the Cambridge Philological Society, I proposed to write *τὰ εἴδη εἶναι τὰ ὡς ἀριθμούς*. I am sorry that here, away from my books, I cannot supply the reference to the Society's *Proceedings*.

H. J.

BOURNEMOUTH,
9 *September* 1915.

EMENDATIONS IN THE EUDEMIAN ETHICS.

I. 1218 b 20 *τὸ δ' ὑγιεινὸν τῆς ὑγιείας αἴτιον ὡς κινῆσαν, καὶ τότε τοῦ εἶναι ἀλλ' οὐ τοῦ* (*τοῦ* Bonitz, *τὸ* MSS.) *ἀγαθὸν εἶναι τὴν ὑγίειαν.*

καὶ τότε is not very satisfactory, and perhaps we should read *καίτοι.*

II. 1220 a 39 *ἐπεὶ δ' ἐστὶ τὸ ἦθος, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα σημαίνει ὅτι ἀπὸ ἔθους ἔχει τὴν ἐπίδοσιν, ἐθίζεται δε τὸ ὑπ' ἀγωγῆς μὴ ἐμφύτου τῷ πολλάκις κινεῖσθαι πώς, οὕτως ἤδη τὸ ἐνεργητικόν,..., διὸ ἔστω ἦθος τοῦτο ψυχῆς κατὰ ἐπιτακτικὸν λόγον < τοῦ ἀλόγου μέν, > δυναμένου δ' ἀκολουθεῖν τῷ λόγῳ ποιότης.*

Some addition like Fritzsche's *τοῦ ἀλόγου μέν* seems to be needed. But there are other difficulties. The words between *ἐνεργητικόν* and *διό* are parenthetical and may be ignored. The sentence is then seen to be an anacoluthon of a type common in Aristotle; the *ἐπεί* clause is followed irregularly by a clause beginning with *διό* which states the conclusion. Fritzsche made the beginning of the sentence easier by bracketing *ὅτι* and reading *ἔχον*, but this is not necessary; the MS. reading expresses not unnaturally the meaning given more grammatically by Fritzsche's reading—'since character, as its name indicates, is something that derives its growth from habit.'

The following words are difficult. Fritzsche reads *ἐθίζεται δὲ ὑπ' ἀγωγῆς τὸ μὴ ἔμφυτον* (in his translation, however, he omits *μή*) and abolishes the comma after *πώς*, taking *τὸ ἐνεργητικόν* as the subject of *κινεῖσθαι*. I.e. besides altering *ἐμφύτου* he has to transpose *τό*, and even then he gets a clause

which leaves *τὸ ἐνεργητικόν* somewhat pointless. Brandis reads *ἐθίζεται δὲ τὸ ὑπ' ἀγωγῆς, μὴ ἔμφυτον, τῷ*, etc., but this is manifestly very awkward and improbable. Rassow condemns *τό*, but this is no improvement. Susemihl prints the traditional text without being satisfied with it.

I venture to think that all we have to do is to insert a comma after *ἐμφύτου* and excise *τό* before *ἐνεργητικόν*. 'That is said to be habituated which by virtue of a guidance not innate in it, by being often moved in a certain way, comes to have a tendency to act in that way.'

Fritzsche inserts *τό* after *διὸ ἔστω*, but it is simpler and better to put a comma after *τοῦτο*. 'Wherefore let character be defined as this, a quality,' etc....

(Since I wrote this note, Dr Jackson has pointed out to me a much better way of taking the first two clauses, viz., to insert a comma after *σημαίνει*, and interpret *ὅτι* as 'that which.' This is evidently right.)

VII. 1238 a 35 *ἐνδέχεται δὲ καὶ ἡδεῖς ἀλλήλοις εἶναι τοὺς φαύλους, καὶ ᾗ* (*ᾗ* Int. Vet., *ἢ* Π^2, *οἱ* P^b) *φαῦλοι ἢ μηδέτεροι, ἀλλ' οἷον ᾠδικοὶ ἄμφω, ἢ ὁ μὲν φιλῳδὸς* (*φιλῳδὸς γρ.* Victorius, *φειδωλὸς* MSS.) *ὁ δ' ᾠδικός ἐστιν, καὶ ᾗ πάντες ἔχουσιν ἀγαθὸν καὶ ταύτῃ συναρμόττουσιν ἀλλήλοις· ἔτι χρήσιμοι ἂν εἶεν ἀλλήλοις καὶ ὠφέλιμοι, οὐχ ἁπλῶς ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὴν προαίρεσιν, ἢ οὐδέτεροι.*

Fritzsche's alteration of *καὶ ᾗ φαῦλοι* to *οὐχ ᾗ φαῦλοι*, in which he follows the *vetus versio* and is followed by Susemihl, does not seem to be right. Bad men may be pleasant to one another (1) (*a*) qua bad, since like loves like (cf. ll. 33, 34), (*b*) not qua either good or bad but in virtue of some neutral quality like fondness for singing, (2) in virtue of some good that is left in them.

At the end of the passage *ἢ οὐδέτεροι* is impossible. Bonitz and Susemihl write *ἢ ᾗ οὐδέτεροι*, but the point of 'or' is by no means clear. It is better to write *ᾗ οὐδέτεροι* simply.

VII. 1246 a 20 *καὶ τοῦτο* (*τοῦτο* Fritzsche, *τότ'* MSS.) *ἐπὶ τῶν χειρόνων συμβαίνει* (*συμβαίνει* Camot., *συμβαίνειν* MSS.)

καὶ διὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰτίαν γίνεσθαι· μάλιστα γὰρ φιλοτιμοῦνται τοὺς φίλους μὴ πράττειν εὖ, μηδ' εἶναι ἀναγκαὶ αὐτοῖς κακῶς. διὸ ἐνίοτε τοὺς ἐρωμένους συναποκτιννύασι.

The last clause is clearly impossible, and many attempts have been made to emend it. Fritzsche prints *μηδ' εἶναι ἂν ἀνάγκη...αὐτοῖς κακῶς*, and thinks that perhaps *ἢ εἶναι* should be inserted after *ἀνάγκη*. It occurs to me that *μηδ' εἶναι, ἂν ἀνάγκη* (sc. *ἢ*) *αὐτοῖς κακῶς* (sc. *πράττειν*) may stand alone in the same sense—'and that their friends should not exist, if they themselves have to fare badly.'

VIII. 1248 a 29 *καὶ διὰ τοῦτο, ὃ* (*ὃ* de bona fortuna libellus, Jackson, *οἱ* MSS.) *πάλαι ἔλεγον, εὐτυχεῖς καλοῦνται οἳ ἂν ὁρμήσωσι κατορθοῦσιν* (*κατορθοῦσιν* de bona fortuna libellus, Fritzsche, *κατορθοῦν* MSS.) *ἄλογοι ὄντες.*

οἳ ἂν ὁρμήσωσι, 'who, if they make a start,' is unsatisfactory, and Dr Jackson proposes *οἳ ἃ ἂν ὁρμήσωσι*. But *οἳ οἳ ἂν ὁρμήσωσι* seems more likely to be right.

VIII. 1248 a 40 *ἔοικε γὰρ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἀπολυομένου τοῦ λόγου* (*ἀπολυομένου τοῦ λόγου* Spengel, *ἀπολυομένους τοὺς λόγους* MSS.) *ἰσχύειν μᾶλλον, καὶ ὥσπερ οἱ τυφλοὶ μνημονεύουσι μᾶλλον ἀπολυθέντες τοῦ πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις εἶναι τὸ μνημονεῦον.*

The author is comparing those who act rightly by an inspiration which is strongest when reason does not interfere, to blind men, who remember better because their memory is freed from attention to things visible. *ἀπολυθέντες...μνημονεῦον* makes no sense. The Latin tradition has *amissisque his que ad uisibilia uirtuosius esse quod memoratur*. On the strength of this Fritzsche and Susemihl read *ἀπολυθέντες τοῦ πρὸς τοῖς ὁρατοῖς, τῷ ἐρρωμενέστερον εἶναι τὸ μνημονεῦον*, which differs too much from both the Greek and the Latin traditions and is not in itself very probable. Jackson improves on this by reading *ἀπολυθέντες τοῦ πρὸς τοῖς ὁρατοῖς εἶναι, τῷ πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις σπουδαιότερον εἶναι τὸ μνημονεῦον*, from which he thinks the Greek and the Latin readings have both been formed by haplography. *εἶναι πρὸς*, 'to attend to,' seems however more natural without an adverb than with one, and

I think it is better to follow the Greek tradition except in one word; *εἰρημένοις* is probably a corruption of *ὁρωμένοις*, which is preserved in the Latin *uisibilia*. We thus get the sense 'being freed from any concern of the memory with the visible.'

VIII. 1249 a 21 *ἐπεὶ δ' ἐστί τις ὅρος καὶ τῷ ἰατρῷ, πρὸς ὃν ἀναφέρων κρίνει τὸ ὑγιαῖνον σῶμα καὶ μή, καὶ* (*καὶ* MSS., om. Ald., Bekker) *πρὸς ὃν μέχρι ποσοῦ ποιητέον ἕκαστον καὶ εὖ ὑγιαῖνον, εἰ δὲ ἔλαττον ἢ πλέον, οὐκέτι· οὕτω*, etc....

ὑγιαῖνον is applicable to the healthy body, *ὑγιεινόν* to that which is healthy or wholesome for the body. Clearly then in l. 22 *ὑγιαῖνον* (P^b) is preferable to *ὑγιεινόν* of the other MSS.; Fritzsche's *σώματι* for *σῶμα* is then unnecessary. In l. 23, on the other hand, *εὖ ὑγιαῖνον* can hardly stand. *ὑγιεινόν* is what is wanted, not *ὑγιαῖνον*, and *εὖ* must be ejected from the text.

W. D. ROSS.

EUDEMIAN ETHICS 1229 a 14; 1235 a 35; 1244 a 1.

Γ i § 15. 1229 a 14 *αὕτη δὲ δι' ἐμπειρίαν καὶ τὸ εἰδέναι, οὐχ ὥσπερ Σωκράτης ἔφη τὰ δεινά, ἀλλ' ὅτι τὰς βοηθείας τῶν δεινῶν.*

"*ὅτι* secludendum esse ci. Sylburgius," says Susemihl: and this correction secures the right sense. But how did *ὅτι* find its way into the text? It seems to me that the original text gave *ἀλλὰ τὸ τὰς βοηθείας τῶν δεινῶν*, sc. *εἰδέναι*.

H i § 14. 1235 a 35 *τοῖς δὲ τὸ χρήσιμον δοκεῖ φίλον εἶναι μόνον. σημεῖον δ' ὅτι καὶ διώκουσι ταῦτα πάντες, τὰ δὲ ἄχρηστα καὶ αὐτοὶ αὑτῶν ἀποβάλλουσιν· ὥσπερ Σωκράτης ὁ γέρων κτλ.* So Susemihl, who comments "*αὐτοὶ αὑτῶν* e Xen. Mem. I, 2, 54 Bonitzius Bu., *αἱ τοιαῦται τῶν**ΤΤ* Ald. Bk. Fr., *αἱ τοιαῦται τῶν <φύσεων>* ci. Sylburgius." In my pamphlet *On some passages in the seventh book of the Eudemian Ethics*, 1900, I proposed, in place of the corrupt *καὶ αἱ τοιαῦται τῶν*, to read *κἂν ἃ τοιαῦτ' αὐτῶν*, "even those parts of themselves which are so." I now think that AI TOIAYTAI TΩN represents AYTOI AΦ EAYTΩN; that is to say, that the sentence should read *τὰ δὲ ἄχρηστα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν ἀποβάλλουσιν.*

H xi § 1. 1244 a 1 *περὶ δὲ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ κατ' ἀρετὴν φίλου, σκεπτέον πότερον δεῖ ἐκείνῳ τὰ χρήσιμα ὑπηρετεῖν καὶ βοηθεῖν ἢ τῷ ἀντιποιοῦντι καὶ δυναμένῳ.*

I suspect that *τῷ ἀντιποιοῦντι καὶ δυναμένῳ* represents *τῷ ἀντιποιεῖν τὰ ἴσα δυναμένῳ*. The equivalences of *ο* and *ε*, of *υ* and *ι*, of *κ* and *ισ*, and of *αι* and *α*, are familiar; and the assimilation of the case of *ἀντιποιοῦντα* to that of *δυναμένῳ* is an inevitable consequence, when once the participle has taken the place of the infinitive.

H. J.

9 *September* 1915.

NOTE ON THE SO-CALLED 'GNOMICA BASILEENSIA.'

Among the many Byzantine Gnomologia is one now known as the *Gnomica Basileensia*, because it appears in the *Scriptores aliquot gnomici* printed in 1521 by Froben at Basel. Attention was drawn to it in 1879 by Curt Wachsmuth in the Satura philologa in honour of Sauppe, where a full list is given of its contents; and it was one of his subsidia for his reconstructed 'Gnomologium Byzantinum' (*Studien zu den griechischen Florilegien*, 1882). Hense also has cited it under the same designation in an article in the *Rh. Mus.*, 39, p. 372.

Wachsmuth incidentally observes that Froben does not reveal where he found the collection. It may be as well, therefore, to put it on record that the Basel printer found it easily enough, having simply 'conveyed' it from a volume printed some few years before in France. In 1512 Mathieu Bolsec of Paris published a little quarto of Greek gnomic literature with 'Illustrium quorundam virorum scitu dignissimae sententiae nunquam antea impressae' as part of its contents. For a description of the book I may refer to M. Omont's 'Essai sur les débuts de la typographie grecque à Paris' (Nos. XII and XIV). The editor was no less a person than Jerome Aleander, who explains in a dedication that he required the text for a course of lectures he was about to give. Nothing is said, however, as to the provenance of the 'sententiae nunquam antea impressae'—whether he had come across them in a MS. in some French library, or had brought them with him in a transcript of a MS. then existing in North Italy. The only MS. now known which has any marked affinity to it is one of the Vossiani; but there are differences between the two not by any means easy of explanation. The matter, though in itself supremely unimportant, may be of some moment hereafter, whenever the time comes for a critically edited collection of the great Byzantine Florilegia.

I. B.

THE EVIDENCE AS TO CAESAR'S LEGAL POSITION IN GAUL.

In a short article in the *Classical Quarterly* (Jan. 1916) Dr Rice Holmes has re-opened for English scholars the intensely interesting question as to the legal issues involved in the senatorial attack on Caesar between 52 and 49 B.C. It is to be supposed that the general acceptance in this country of the main conclusions arrived at nearly 60 years ago by Mommsen was due, not to the authority of his name, but to independent examination of the evidence which he adduced. It is at any rate somewhat surprising to one, who had accepted Mommsen's conclusion on the evidence, but had not followed more recent discussions on the subject, to learn, not only that an essentially different view, propounded by Hirschfeld, has meanwhile dominated the learned world for nearly ten years and has now been itself put out of court by a still more convincing theory on the part of Judeich, but that the few who still hold the earlier view are regarded as the mere devotees of a 'pious faith'[1].

It is some consolation however to find among these devotees a scholar and historian of so much repute as Dr Rice Holmes, and I regard his article as a valuable protest against the tendency to accept the latest German theories at their own valuation. My only regret is that he has been far too lenient and on the defensive with 'Hirschfeld and the rest'[2], and has

[1] Mommsen's monograph *Die Rechtfrage zwischen Caesar und dem Senat*, published in 1857, is to be found in *Hist. Schrift.* Vol. I, pp. 92 to 145. Hirschfeld's articles are in *Klio* IV, pp. 76—87 and V, pp. 236—240. That of Judeich is in *Rhein. Mus.* 1913, pp. 1 to 10.

[2] The phrase is quoted by Dr Rice Holmes from "the writers of the article on Latin Literature in *The Year's Work in Classical Studies*

contented himself with exposing the fallacious interpretation put upon certain crucial passages, instead of carrying the war into the enemies' country by a review of the evidence as a whole.

That is what I propose to attempt. Having read and re-read Hirschfeld's two articles and that of Judeich, I must confess myself unable to comprehend how their reasoning can have convinced any one conversant with the evidence and appreciative of the principles of constitutional law and procedure involved. Much of the evidence, not only of the later writers, but even of Cicero and Caelius, is wholly ignored, while the important passages on which the argument is concentrated are not only in some cases taken apart from their immediate context, but are not viewed in connexion with the situations to which they refer. In order to make my examination of the evidence as far as possible an independent contribution to the problem, I have refrained from consulting Mommsen's treatise, which I have not read for some 25 years, and I have not read the paper in which Holzapfel replied to Hirschfeld's first article in *Klio*.

With a view of making my paper, what is all I claim for it, a study of the evidence, I shall consider the questions involved under the following separate heads; 1. The evidence for the second *quinquennium*; 2. The question *de successione Caesaris*; 3. The second consulship of Caesar and the tribunician law of 52; 4. The evidence derived from Pompey's attitude; and 5. The legal position of Caesar after 52. I had better admit at once that this method will involve a certain amount of repetition. The same passages may have to be cited in different connexions, the same constitutional points will come to the front more than once, and even the same incidents in the chain of events cannot on this method be disposed of once for all. I

(1915)." If Judeich stands for 'the rest,' it might be shown, if it were worth while, that on every essential point the two confute one another. I cannot but feel that Dr Rice Holmes seriously weakens his own position (1) by admitting that in *ad fam.* 8, 8, 4 and *ad Att.* 8, 3, 3 the 'Kalends of March' refer to 50, and (2) by the hesitating attitude which he takes up with regard to the 'Ides of November' in *ad fam.* 8, 11, 3. I deal with the points in their proper place.

am not however without hope that some cumulative weight will be added to my argument, the object of which is not historical exposition, but the sifting of evidence.

Standing out from many minor, though not unimportant points, the main question to be decided is, what was the legal period for which Caesar's provincial command was prorogued by the *lex Pompeia-Licinia* of 55? Was it extended, as Mommsen argued, for a full *quinquennium* from March 1, 54, and so to March 1, 49? Was it prolonged, as Hirschfeld maintains, with no specified legal termination, the senate however being precluded from raising the question *de successione Caesaris* till March 1, 50? Or was it extended, as Judeich pretends, for a nominal *quinquennium*, shortened however, by Caesar's own consent, to an actual period of four years and ten months, and so ending on Dec. 29, 50? Whichever of these three arrangements was agreed upon at the conference of Luca, it is not disputed that, but for the *lex Pompeia de iure magistratuum*, passed in 52, there would have been no legal or constitutional question at all, and Caesar, under the operation, as explained below, of the Sullan provincial system and the *lex Sempronia*, would have been entitled to retain his command till the end of 49.

I. The evidence for the second *QUINQUENNIUM*.

As against Hirschfeld's contention that the *lex Pompeia-Licinia* established no fixed termination of Caesar's command, this is of primary importance. I propose to examine the statements made with some care.

Suetonius. (*Iul.* 24 to 30.) In 56 Caesar, threatened by the candidature of Ahenobarbus and the expressed intention to recall him, *Crassum Pompeiumque in urbem provinciae suae Lucam extractos compulit ut...consulatum alterum peterent, perfecitque per utrumque ut in quinquennium sibi imperium prorogaretur.*

Now Suetonius clearly believed that the command was to last till the end of 49. (*a*) In mentioning that Caesar started for his province soon after laying down his consulship (c. 23),

he presumably takes this as the beginning of the first *quinquennium*. (*b*) In c. 25 he speaks of the nine years *quibus in imperio fuit*; i.e. to the end of 50, so that he must have regarded 49 as the tenth year. (*c*) When in 52 the tribunes wished to make Caesar Pompey's colleague, he urged them *id potius ad populum ferrent, absenti sibi, quandoque imperii tempus expleri coepisset, ut petitio secundi consulatus daretur, ne ea causa maturius decederet* (c. 26). As the *absentis ratio* was certainly, as we shall see, for the elections in 49, that was the time when the command was beginning to expire, and the privilege prevented it from being shortened by the last six months of the year (conf. *semenstre imperium*). (*d*) In c. 28 Marcellus, consul in 51, is said to have made two proposals; 1. *ut ei succederetur ante tempus*; 2. *ne absentis ratio comitiis haberetur, quando nec plebiscito Pompeius postea abrogasset* (i.e. since Pompey's subsequent action in 52 had not really cancelled the privilege). Suetonius evidently supposed that Caesar's recall would have taken place, if the proposal of Marcellus had been carried, about the time when he would make use of the tribunician law, i.e. in the first half of 49. This is consistent with Cicero's statement that Marcellus tried to terminate the command *Kalendarum Martiarum die* (*ad Att.* 8, 3, 3) and it would be *ante tempus*, if 49 was the tenth year of the command. If Marcellus had really thought, as Hirschfeld supposes, that Caesar could be recalled on March 1, 50, his second proposal would have been unnecessary, since conditions under which the *absentis ratio* could be exercised would have been extinguished for 16 months before July 49. Suetonius did not make this blunder, though Hirschfeld's guide, Dio, makes a far worse one, but his statement is vitiated (*a*) by the false *terminus a quo*, 58 instead of 59, and (*b*) by the assumption that in any case a proposal could have been seriously considered for recalling Caesar before the expiration of his legal period. We may take it as absolutely certain that, whatever that period was, no attempt was made by the constitutionalist party to curtail it. We need not decide at this point whether the motion of Marcellus was wrecked by the veto of tribunes (c. 29) or by a vote of the senate (Hirt. *b. g.*

8, 53) or by the resistance of Pompey (*ad Att.* 8, 3, 3), while the exact meaning of the phrase *at Caesari succederetur* will be discussed in the next section.

In c. 29 Suetonius distinctly says that in 50 C. Marcellus made the same attempt as his predecessor, i.e. to recall Caesar *ante tempus*. If so, it was certainly not, in the opinion of Suetonius, a proposal to recall Caesar at once after March 1, 50, as Hirschfeld contends, but in 49. Caesar's reply, according to Suetonius, was to demand *ne sibi beneficium populi adimeretur*. Whether the *beneficium* was the tribunician law, and not, as I am inclined to think, the law extending his command to the end of the year, it was virtually that extension which Caesar demanded, since only on that condition was the *absentis ratio* either applicable or of consequence. It appears therefore that the evidence of Suetonius, though needing correction, is not without method and consistency and deserves more attention than it has sometimes received.

Appian.

In 2, 17 Appian states that it was arranged at Luca for Pompey and Crassus to be consuls in 55, and for Caesar's command to be extended for five years. In c. 18 we have the carrying out of this arrangement. *Αἱρεθέντες δ' οὖν ὕπατοι Κράσσος τε καὶ Πομπήιος Καίσαρι μέν, ὥσπερ ὑπέστησαν, τὴν ἑτέραν πενταετίαν προσεψηφίσαντο.* In c. 25 Caesar is said to have secured the passing of the tribunician law, because he feared *ὑπὸ τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ἰδιώτης γενέσθαι*. Appian goes on to say, clearly referring to the next year 51, that Caesar, wishing *ἐπὶ δυνάμεως εἶναι, μέχρι ὕπατος ἀποδειχθείη, καὶ τὴν βουλὴν ᾔτει χρόνον ἄλλον ὀλίγον ἐς τὴν παροῦσάν οἱ τῆς Γαλατίας ἡγεμονίαν ἐπιλαβεῖν*, but Marcellus prevented this. Appian therefore, like Suetonius, believed that the end of the command was in the same year as the consular elections for which the *absentis ratio* was required, i.e. 49. The short extension which Caesar begged for would be either from March 1 to July, or more probably till the end of the year. The action of Marcellus, which Suetonius represents as a motion *ne absentis ratio comitiis haberetur*, is, according to Appian, the refusal of a demand

made by Caesar. It seems to me that this demand, made in 51, according to Appian, is the same as the letter sent, according to Suetonius, in 50. It is uncertain which, if either, is correct, but Appian seems to recognise, as Suetonius did not, that the legal term ended early in the year.

In c. 26 Appian agrees with Suetonius as to the proposal of Marcellus in 51 for superseding Caesar, though his phrase *προαφαιρῶν τοῦ χρόνου* is ambiguous. Pompey's opposition, coupled however with the declaration *ὅτι χρὴ μετὰ τὸν χρόνον παραλύειν τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτίκα τὸν Καίσαρα* is in complete agreement with *ad Att.* 8, 3, 3 and *ad fam.* 8, 8, 4. Appian also agrees that C. Marcellus in 50 made exactly the same proposal at a date *ὡς ἔληγεν ὁ χρόνος*, words consistent enough with the command expiring on March 1, 49, but inconsistent with Hirschfeld's view that the *legis dies* had arrived when Marcellus made his proposal.

Lastly (c. 28), Appian says that Pompey, later in the year, made a show of willingness to resign his command so as to create a prejudice against Caesar as *οὐκ ἀποδιδόντος τὴν ἀρχὴν οὐδ' ἐν τῷ νενομισμένῳ χρόνῳ*. Hirschfeld, strangely ignoring the tense of *ἀποδιδόντος*, takes these words as proving that Caesar's term had already expired, and, as this is inconsistent with the five years' extension, suggests that Appian is here inadvertently following the good authority of Asinius Pollio (*Klio*, IV, p. 81). On the contrary, Pompey's point, clear to every one but a German Professor with a theory to establish, is that Caesar, with his claim to the *absentis ratio*, was not likely to resign even on the legal termination of his command. If these words come from Asinius Pollio, that historian proves that there was a fixed *legis dies* and that it had not arrived in the middle of 50.

Livy.

On the whole the evidence of the epitomator is in favour of the second *quinquennium*, though his statement is ambiguously worded and in one point incorrect. In *epit.* 105 mention is made of Cato's opposition to the law *qua provinciae consulibus in quinquennium, Pompeio Hispaniae, Crasso Syria...*

Caesari Gallia et Germania dabantur. The mistake is that Caesar's extension is included in the Trebonian law: the ambiguity lies in the position of *in quinquennium*, which, as the sentence stands, does not with certainty apply to Caesar. I cannot doubt however that the order of the words is a mere inadvertency, for it is not likely that, if Livy had given different conditions of tenure to the two laws, the epitomator would have made the mistake of merging them in one. But we get an additional side light on the question in *epit.* 107, where, speaking of the *contentiones inter consules* (in 51) *de successore Caesari mittendo*, the epitomator says: *agente in senatu M. Marcello cos. ut Caesar in petitionem consulatus veniret, cum is lege lata in id tempus consulatus provinciam obtinere deberet.* This passage, added to those in Suetonius and Appian, establishes in my opinion the fact that the question of the *absentis ratio* came up in connexion with the termination of Caesar's command, which it could only have done if the command was to end in 49. I agree with Hirschfeld that the words *lege lata* must refer to the tribunician law, and not to the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*. The point is that, under the conditions existing when the former law was passed, Caesar had the right (*deberet*) to retain his provinces till entering on the consulship. On the assumption that he was to be consul in 48, nothing but the tribunician law could give him the last *semenstre imperium* in 49. The evidence therefore of the epitomator, when fairly examined, is in favour of the second *quinquennium*.

Of Velleius (2, 46) and Plutarch (*Pomp.* 51; *Caes.* 21; *Crass.* 15) I will only remark that the one is a comparatively early authority, who may well have followed Livy, while the other is at least explicit, and repeats his statement in three separate Lives.

But though the consensus of these historians is strong evidence, that of Cicero, if it is forthcoming, would of course be far more conclusive. Now there are four passages, which may be and have been interpreted in such a way as to confirm the historians. In contesting this interpretation, Hirschfeld is on the defensive, since, with one possible exception, there is nothing in any passage to suggest an extension shorter than five years.

1. *ad Att.* 7, 7, 5—6, written between Dec. 18 and 21, 50. In discussing whether any classes or orders deserve to be called 'good,' Cicero asks: "Do you think the senate 'good,'" *per quem provinciae sine imperio sunt; nunquam enim Curio sustinuisset, si cum eo agi coeptum esset, quam sententiam senatus sequi noluit; ex quo factum est ut Caesari non succederetur.* Taken as a whole, the sentence was no doubt intended to imply that, as the motion necessary for appointing Caesar's successors had been vetoed, and the veto had remained unchallenged, the Gallic provinces were *sine imperio.* But Cicero is clearly speaking loosely and inaccurately, for, as Caesar by Cicero's own admission had not been superseded, he still held the *imperium*, or, if that had really lapsed earlier in the year, what is the meaning of Cicero's own following phrase *annorum decem imperium?* All that Cicero can mean is that the future *imperium* of Gaul was still unfixed. If any province was *sine imperio*, it was Cilicia, but that was due not to the senate but to Cicero's abrupt desertion of it.

But Cicero goes on: *Quid ergo? exercitum retinentis cum legis dies transierit rationem haberi placet? Mihi vero ne absentis quidem, sed cum id datum est, illud una datum est. Annorum enim decem imperium et ita latum† placet? Placet igitur etiam me expulsum et agrum Campanum perisse...Sed horum omnium fons unus est. Imbecillo resistendum fuit;...Nunc legiones XI, etc. Cum hoc depugnandum est aut habenda e lege ratio.*

Hirschfeld maintains (*a*) that the words *cum legis dies transierit* prove that Caesar's legal tenure was already at an end; (*b*) that *annorum decem imperium* refers to the actual not the legal length of the command. It seems to me that his first point is urged in defiance of both grammar and logic. Grammatically, the tense of *transierit* shows that the *legis dies* is still in the future, and this is perfectly consistent with its being March 1, 49. Logically, how on Hirschfeld's own view can Caesar's command have been legally terminated in Dec., 50? His own point is that March 1, 50 was the only time limit specified in the law, and that this limit was merely 'preclusive,' or, as it became after 52, permissive. In other words, the law laid down no fixed termination of the command, but allowed

the senate on or after March 1, 50 to take the necessary steps for Caesar's recall. The expiration therefore of the *legis dies* in Hirschfeld's 'preclusive' sense by no means implied any legal obligation on Caesar's part to lay down his command, unless the senate by effective decree or decrees had taken steps to send him a successor. Will Hirschfeld pretend that up to Dec. it had done so? Do not Cicero's words *ex quo factum est ut Caesari non succederetur* prove that it had not?

As for the second point, Hirschfeld argues that the preceding sentence and the explanatory *enim* prove that *annorum decem imperium* is actual not legal. But he naturally finds the words *et ita latum* inconvenient to his theory, as indeed they are fatal, and so he arbitrarily substitutes for them *ei ita datum*, and rejects *placet* at the mutilated end of the clause. It is usually a weak case which resorts to tampering with the text, and the force of *enim* is not difficult to detect. Cicero answers one question by asking another. "Do I approve of the *absentis ratio*? How should I, for do I approve of the ten years' command conferred by such a law?" It is really an *a fortiori* argument; "I disapproved of the ten years' command and of our weakness which made it possible; still more do I disapprove of the canvass in absence, which would be *cum legis dies transierit*[1]."

2. *ad Att.* 7, 9, 2—4, written between Dec. 24 and 27, 50. Cicero is discussing the situation created by Caesar's demand to be enabled to use the *absentis ratio*, and sets forth a number of possible alternatives. He agrees with Atticus that the best thing would be if Caesar could be persuaded to give up his provinces and canvass in person, though even so, his consulship would be a disaster. On the other hand, the worst thing would be *haberi rationem Caesaris, illo exercitum vel per senatum*

[1] I cannot compliment Hirschfeld on his manipulation of this passage, which, with the ordinary text, he knows well to be fatal to his position. He therefore tampers with *latum*, and by rejecting *placet*, tries to discount the sentence by making it unintelligible. *Placet*, he declares, belongs to the next clause. No doubt, but that is no reason why the same word should not end the previous one, though a careless scribe might easily regard it as an accidental dittograph, and omit it. (See *Klio* v, p. 237.)

vel per tribunos obtinente. (The last words evidently imply that the *tempus legis* would have passed, but that the senate, either voluntarily or prevented by *intercessio*, would not have effectively superseded Caesar.)

Remarking on the impudence of this demand, Cicero thus addresses the absent Caesar: *Tenuisti provinciam per annos decem, non tibi a senatu sed a te ipso per vim et per factionem datos* (this is merely the old grievance of an extraordinary law, instead of regular senatorial conferment); *praeteriit tempus non legis sed libidinis tuae, fac tamen legis; decernitur ut succedatur. Impedis et ais: 'habe rationem meam';...Exercitum tu habeas diutius quam populus iussit invito senatu?*

Now this is the passage on which Hirschfeld chiefly relies as a demonstration that Caesar's command did not legally extend till March 1, 49, because, as a matter of fact, it had already expired before the date of Cicero's letter[1]. Let us see then in the first place whether there is the slightest difficulty in interpreting the address to Caesar on the assumption that the *tempus legis* was the end of a second *quinquennium*, i.e. March 1, 49. If it was, then the question of the *absentis ratio*, though already debated and already disturbing, would not become absolutely critical till that date arrived. That was the day on which all eyes were fixed, as indeed they had long been fixed; that was the day by which both Caesar and the senate must have determined on their course of action. Is it not clear that Cicero addresses Caesar from the standpoint of that critical day? "When the day comes and Caesar gives effect to his impudent demand by staying in his province, this is what we shall say to him." This simple explanation, suggested by the whole context of the letter, removes every difficulty, and we are no longer reduced to the grotesque expedient of understanding by *decem annos* 'nine years nine

[1] *Klio* IV, p. 80. Judeich (*Rhein. Mus.* 1913, p. 5) takes the phrases *cum legis dies transierit* and *praeteriit tempus...legis* as proving that Caesar's legal term was expiring at or about the date of Cicero's words. I admit that the latter is not fatal to the term being Dec. 29, 50, but Judeich, who admits the second *quinquennium*, has to regard it as consisting really of only four years and ten months. My interpretation stands against his view as against that of Hirschfeld.

months and twenty-seven days.' I should have thought that in any case it was sufficiently obvious that *tenuisti provinciam per annos decem*[1] and *praeteriit tempus...legis* are intended to be two different ways of saying precisely the same thing. The *decem annos...a te ipso datos* correspond exactly with the *tempus non legis sed libidinis tuae, fac tamen legis.*

But Hirschfeld's assertion that the words *praeteriit tempus... legis* prove that Caesar's term had already expired, cannot be allowed to escape so easily. He avails himself, perhaps inadvertently, certainly illegitimately, of the ambiguity which he has himself imported into the meaning of *legis dies.* He declares that the only time limit specified in the *lex Pompeia-Licinia* was March 1, 50, but that this was merely a preclusive or permissive limit, on or after which day the senate was free to take steps for Caesar's recall. But the arrival of this date did not *ex hypothesi* terminate Caesar's legal tenure of his provinces, unless the senate was willing and able to use the permission given it, and to pass the decree or decrees necessary to bring about Caesar's supersession. Not until the senate had effectively taken these steps would the *legis dies* in the full and natural sense be reached. In Dec. 50 the *tempus... legis* in the first sense had of course long passed, but the present passage can only disprove, as Hirschfeld declares that it does, the full five years' extension, if *tempus...legis* is taken in the second sense. But the senate had all through the year been prevented from passing effective decrees, and this very passage proves that it was still vainly trying to accomplish this end. How else does Hirschfeld propose to interpret the words, *ut succedatur decernitur; impedis?* "Decrees for appointing your successors are under consideration: you block the way." Perhaps some of the scholars, who regard Hirschfeld's arguments as convincing, will take the preliminary step of showing that they are not self-contradictory.

[1] To get rid of *annorum decem imperium* by talking about round numbers is inadmissible where the point is precise and legal. On the other hand, round numbers are natural enough where the total length of the Gallic campaigns is summed up. It is in such a context that Suetonius (c. 25) and Caesar himself (*b. c.* 1, 7) speak of nine years, though Caesar was only eight years and nine months actually in Gaul.

3. *ad Att.* 7, 6, 2. *Cur autem nunc primum ei resistamus?*

Οὐ γὰρ δὴ τόδε μεῖζον ἐπὶ κακόν.

quam cum quinquennium prorogabamus, aut cum ut absentis ratio haberetur ferebamus?

4. *Phil.* 2, 10, 24. *Duo tamen tempora inciderunt quibus aliquid contra Caesarem Pompeio suaserim;...unum, ne quinquenni imperium Caesari prorogaret; alterum, ne pateretur ferri ut absentis eius ratio haberetur.*

It is obvious that neither of these passages is against the theory of a five years' extension; the only question is whether they positively favour it. Hirschfeld's assertion that *quinquenni imperium* can only be the five years of the *lex Vatinia* is far from settling the matter, and the context in both passages is against him. The extension of *imperium* is in both brought into close connexion with the *absentis ratio*, and the latter could only be of use to Caesar, and therefore a danger to his opponents, if the extension was a *quinquennium*. Besides, the words of *ad Att.* 7, 7, 6 show that what Cicero disapproved was not the prolongation in itself, but a prolongation constituting a *decem annorum imperium*.

Dio Cassius.

Of all the ancient historians Dio alone disbelieves in the five years' extension, and Hirschfeld, in spite of his contempt for later writers, is not disinclined to find some support from this disbelief. The statements relied on are three.

1. In 39, 33, after mentioning the five years' command secured for themselves by Pompey and Crassus, Dio says that they disarmed the opposition of Caesar's friends ὥστε τὴν ἡγεμονίαν καὶ ἐκείνῳ τρία ἔτη πλείω, ὥς γε τἀληθὲς εὑρίσκεται, μηκῦναι. This statement is supposed to be the more valuable, because it depends on Dio's own reasoning and not on mere tradition. 2. Consistently with this, Antony in his funeral speech is made to say to the people in 44, 43, that they had granted to Caesar ὅπερ, ἀφ' οὗ ἐδημοκρατήθημεν, οὐδενὶ ἄλλῳ ὑπῆρχε, λέγω δὲ τὸ ὀκτὼ ἔτεσιν ὅλοις ἐφεξῆς ἡγεμονεῦσαι. 3. In 40, 59, Dio states that, when Marcellus in 51 proposed

to send successors to Caesar even before the time, Pompey opposed, ἔπραττε δ' ὅπως, ὅταν τὸν δεδομένον οἱ χρόνον διαπράξῃ, τοῦτο δὲ οὐκ ἐς μακρὰν, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς ἐν τῷ ὑστέρῳ ἔτει γενήσεσθαι ἔμελλεν, τά τε ὅπλα κατάθηται, καὶ ἰδιωτεύσων οἴκαδε ἐπανέλθῃ.

Now the second statement is obviously a mere deduction from the first, and if the third can be regarded as a deduction from the other two, it is worthless, since the reasoning by which Dio infers the three years' extension is demonstrably false. If the eight years, ending in 50, were made up of a five years' period and a three years' period, then the five years must have ended in March 53, but the one point on which all scholars are agreed, is that the first *quinquennium* ended on Feb. 28, 54, and therefore Dio's three years would have to end in 51. As a matter of fact, Dio has hopelessly vitiated the calculation, which Hirschfeld thinks so preferable to a conscientious following of authorities, by a false *terminus a quo*.

It seems to me however more likely that Dio's first two statements are deductions from the third. If so, it is important to ask whether the view that Caesar's command ended early in 50 was derived from some authority, or was, as I suspect, a too clever pre-Teutonic conjecture of his own.

It is clear from 40, 59 that in 51 Marcellus proposed *ut Caesari succederetur*, and that the *successio* was *ante tempus*. But Dio misunderstands both phrases. It is proved by *b. g.* 8, 53 (to be cited later) that *ante tempus* refers to the *relatio* of Marcellus and not to the date of the recall, while, as we shall see in the next section, the motion *ut Caesari succederetur* merely meant that Caesar's provinces should be fixed as consular or praetorian for some specified year. Dio thinks that it was a proposal for instant recall, and that Pompey opposed it on that ground. He does not state the proposal of C. Marcellus in 50, but he undoubtedly thought with Suetonius and Appian that it was the same proposal over again, i.e. in his view for instant recall in March 50. It is surprising that an historian of Hirschfeld's reputation should take the same view (*Klio*, IV, p. 86), especially as we know from the s. c. of Sep. 29, 51 that the motion to be made by Marcellus on March 1, 50 was *de provinciis consularibus* (*ad fam.* 8, 8, 5).

Dio, however, believing the proposal in 50 to be for instant recall, and knowing that Pompey did not oppose it, supposed, in view of Pompey's declaration of the previous year, that this was because the legal term had now expired. The statement therefore that Caesar's command was to end in 50 seems to be a mistaken inference from phrases that were misunderstood. I would not lay too much stress on Dio's inconsistency in making Antony say that Caesar was actually brought back before his term had expired (44, 43), but I own to some surprise that Hirschfeld, who speaks with much superiority on the inability of other scholars to evaluate witnesses, should follow the speculations of an historian, who throughout this section hopelessly misunderstands the relations of Caesar and Pompey. To establish this judgement, it is enough to point out that no allusion is made to the conference of Luca; that Pompey and Crassus are represented as seeking the consulship for 55 out of jealousy of Caesar; that their main object is to secure commands for themselves, and that the idea of extending Caesar's command is a pure afterthought occasioned by the hostility of Caesar's friends to their own schemes, an attitude which of course explains the short extension.

Hirtius.

Hirschfeld finds some confirmation of Dio's statement that Caesar's command was to end in 50 in a passage of *b. g.* 8, 39, where Caesar is stated in the summer of 51 to have hastened forward the siege of Uxellodunum, *cum omnibus Gallis notum esse sciret reliquam esse unam aestatem suae provinciae, quam si sustinere potuissent, nullum ultra periculum vererentur.* Hirschfeld argues that *reliquam unam aestatem* must refer to the summer of 51 not of 50; (*a*) on Bardt's authority, who declares that *unam* can only mean 'this one' and (*b*) because, if Caesar had had the summer of 50 before him, there would have been no need so to hasten the siege. To both these points Dr Rice Holmes' reply is irresistible. (*a*) It is clear from c. 46 that at the time of the siege only a small part of the summer of 51 was left, i.e. not *unam aestatem*, but *exiguam partem unius aestatis.* (*b*) An immediate success at Uxel-

lodunum might leave Caesar's last year free for settlement and conciliation, and might shatter the Gallic hope of a last year's successful resistance.

But apart from this, what was there on Hirschfeld's theory for the Gauls to know in the summer of 51? Of course if Dio is right, and Caesar's legal eight years were to end in 50, the Gauls might have known that. But Hirschfeld, while profiting by Dio's calculations, does not venture to accept his statement of facts. On his own theory there was nothing in the *lex Pompeia-Licinia* limiting Caesar's command except a clause disallowing discussion of it till March 1, 50. Was this what the Gauls knew, and if they knew it, does Hirschfeld pretend that they also knew what the result of the discussion would be, when the time came? Or did they understand the highly technical reasons which, after Pompey's law of 52, had turned a clause originally favourable to Caesar into a possible weapon against him? They might have heard of the hostile attempt of Marcellus in the spring, but if so, they would also have heard of its defeat. They certainly could not have known of the senatorial decrees, obviously hostile to Caesar, passed on Sep. 29, because the siege of Uxellodunum was earlier than that date. On the other hand, if the *lex Pompeia-Licinia* gave Caesar a second *quinquennium*, the Gauls would certainly have known this, and as the summer of 51 passed away, the knowledge would be a motive for more obstinate resistance with a view of getting through the approaching last year. (See *Klio*, IV, p. 82 and V, p. 237.)

II. De successione Caesaris.

The first question *de successione Caesaris* arose in 56, when Ahenobarbus openly threatened *se ei adempturum exercitum* (Suet. *Iul.* 24). What happened was a debate in the senate to fix the consular provinces for 54 according to the *lex Sempronia*. Caesar's opponents wished that one or both of the Gauls should be selected so that he might be recalled. Cicero was ordered, as his *παλινῳδία* for the rash step taken earlier in the year, to defeat this scheme. It is by means of his

arguments on this occasion that several important points can be proved.

1. Caesar's first five years ended on Feb. 29, 54, and therefore must have begun on March 1, 59. How is it possible, Cicero asks, for a consul of 55 to succeed Caesar in 54? *Fuerit toto in consulatu sine provincia, cui ante quam designatus est decreta provincia. Sortietur an non? Nam et non sortiri absurdum est, et quod sortitus sis non habere. Proficiscetur paludatus? Quo? quo pervenire ante certam diem non licebit. Ianuario Februario provinciam non habebit: Kal. denique Martiis nascetur repente provincia* (*de prov. cons.* 15, 37). This proves conclusively that Caesar was in possession till March 1, 54. 2. Provincial commands under existing Sullan arrangements were bound to begin on Jan. 1. *Mihi nihil videtur alienius a dignitate disciplinaque maiorum quam ut qui consul Kal. Ian. habere provinciam debet, is ut eam desponsam non decretam habere videatur.* 3. The only constitutional way of appointing a successor to a provincial governor, except by means of a special law, was to fix his province in advance as either consular or praetorian. How e.g. could Piso or Gabinius be recalled from Macedonia and Syria? *Faciam, inquit, illas praetorias, ut Pisoni et Gabinio succedatur statim* (i.e. in Jan. next year). But this might be stopped by tribunician *intercessio. Mihi credite; nunquam succedetur illis, nisi ea lege referetur qua intercedi de provinciis non licebit*, i.e. by making the provinces consular for 54 in accordance with the *lex Sempronia*, which prohibited *intercessio* (*de prov. cons.* 7, 17). 4. The phrase *ut Caesari succedatur* does not mean therefore that a successor shall be forthwith sent to replace Caesar, but that his provinces shall be fixed as consular or praetorian, with a view to a successor being sent at the proper time. This is of course all that Cicero means, when he writes in 56: *Nam...ne Caesari lege Sempronia succederetur facile perfectum est:* Caesar's provinces were not made consular for 54 in accordance with the *lex Sempronia* (*ad fam.* 1, 7, 10). As we shall meet this phrase again, it is as well to note its meaning.

The question *de successione Caesaris* does not meet us

again till 51, the *lex Pompeia-Licinia* having meanwhile been passed, extending Caesar's command and, whatever term it fixed, certainly forbidding any motion *de successione Caesaris* till March 1, 50. But the whole question *de provinciis* was now complicated by Pompey's law of 52 requiring a five years' interval between the consulship or praetorship and a provincial command. This put an end to the Sullan system of provincial succession, and at the least rendered uncertain the applicability of the *lex Sempronia* to consular provinces.

Now in dealing with the motion *de successione* made by M. Marcellus in 51, it must be insisted that, in spite of Suetonius and Dio, there could have been no question of recalling Caesar before the termination of his legal command. To admit that there could is to deny that there was any legal or constitutional question at all, and to make Pompey's law, admittedly directed against Caesar, irrelevant to the situation. The phrase *ante tempus* receives its full explanation from the statement of Hirtius (*b. g.* 8, 53), *Marcellus...cum impugnaret Caesaris dignitatem, contra legem Pompei et Crassi rettulit ante tempus de Caesaris provinciis.*

What then was his motion, and why did he make it *ante tempus?* No one will doubt that his proposal was, *ut Caesari succederetur*, rendered by Dio and Appian as *διαδόχους πέμπειν τῷ Καίσαρι*. We may further take it from Cicero's words (*ad Att.* 8, 3, 3), *M. Marcello consuli finienti provincias Gallias Kalendarum Martiarum die*, that the recall of Caesar was to be effective on March 1 in either 50 or 49. I may perhaps pause for a moment temporarily to dispose of Judeich, who by the way is discreetly silent about this proposal. Unless he rejects Cicero's evidence altogether, he is bound to take the date as March 1, 50, and as by his own theory Caesar's legal term did not end till Dec. 29 of that year, he is convicted of the irrational view that Marcellus by a decree of the senate tried to shorten Caesar's legal term by ten months.

Let us first on the strength of the evidence examined in section I take the motion *ut Caesari succederetur* to mean that one or both of the Gallic provinces were to be consular after March 1, 49. This would be taking advantage of Pompey's

law, since on the older system a governorship could not begin on March 1, or on any date but Jan. 1, and if carried, it would mean Caesar's recall on the lapse of his legal term.

It is usually assumed that the effect of the five years' interval was to abrogate the *lex Sempronia*, and no doubt on the principle, *cessante legis ratione cessat ipsa lex*, this would be the case. But we do not know the wording of the law, and there may well have been some uncertainty on the point early in 51[1]. This would explain the precipitate motion of Marcellus, for, if the law was still in force, the only way of superseding Caesar in 49 was to fix his provinces as consular for that year before the elections in 51; and even if it was not in force, it might well seem advisable to take immediate advantage of Pompey's law, while there was at least one consul to be depended upon. Of course the motion involved the violation of a *sanctio* in the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*, but there are many examples to show that there was a great difference between violating a law and disregarding sanctions in it intended to restrict the free actions of magistrates. It was at least worth trying, and, if Pompey's conscience had been less tender, the *optimates* might have carried their point.

On the other hand, the alternative view of Hirschfeld that Marcellus proposed *finire provincias Gallias* on March 1, 50, is full of difficulties. (*a*) The motion would not only be *contra legem Pompei et Crassi* (not a fatal objection), but by boldly treating the *lex Sempronia* as defunct, it laid itself open to tribunician *intercessio*[2], and would not have had the smallest

[1] When later in the year it was decreed that the question *de provinciis consularibus* should be brought up on March 1, 50, it was assumed that the *lex Sempronia* was out of force, but to provide against possible illegality, the magistrates of this or the following year were instructed, *si quid de ea re ad populum pl.ve lato opus esset,...uti... ad populum pl.ve ferrent* (*ad fam.* 8, 8, 5). I am not aware that this passage has hitherto been so explained but I have no doubt that thi is the solution.

[2] This is proved by the passage in *de prov. cons.* 7, 17, quoted above. The proposal would have been so hopeless owing to this liability that it seems necessary to suppose that the *optimates* were so far upholding the *lex Sempronia*, just as long of course as it suited their purpose. If Suetonius is right that tribunes opposed Marcellus, it must have been to maintain the Pompeio-Licinian sanction. But probably a senatorial vote defeated him, as Hirtius declares (*b. g.* 8, 53).

chance, even if Pompey had concurred. (*b*) Why should Marcellus have fixed upon March 1, 50, as the date on which the Gallic provinces were to become consular? On Dio's view we could understand it, but on Hirschfeld's, the date, being preclusive, had no significance, unless it was observed, and for Marcellus to make it the end of Caesar's command would have been nothing but an impudent advertisement of his own illegality. (*c*) Marcellus must have known, though Hirschfeld apparently forgets, that it was out of his power to make the Gallic provinces consular on March 1, 50, because the two consular provinces, Cilicia and Syria, held by Cicero and Bibulus, would not be vacated till four or five months after that date, and it has been shown from *de prov. cons.* 7, 17, that there was no other way of superseding Caesar.

The defeat of Marcellus meant that the *successio Caesaris* would have to be postponed till next year. But this was now part of a wider question *de provinciis*, which Pompey's *lex de iure magistratuum* had rendered urgent and complicated. It is clear from Caelius that something was still expected from Marcellus, who was hanging back *non inertia sed...consilio* (*ad fam.* 8, 2, 2). A fruitless attempt was made to raise the question *de successione Caesaris hoc est de provinciis* in July (ib. 8, 4, 4), and it was believed that in August *aut transigetur aliquid aut turpiter intercedetur.*

The abolition of the Sullan system in 52 had thrown the whole *successio provinciarum* out of gear. We must assume that the consular provinces for 51, Syria and Cilicia, had been fixed in 53 in the usual way, but that after Pompey's law it was impossible to assign them to the consuls of 52, and therefore, but not without a delay of some months, Bibulus and Cicero were sent out. As for the praetorian provinces, those for 51 may have been allotted in 52 before Pompey's law was passed, but quite possibly there was the same delay, and for the same reason, in sending out the governors. At any rate, it is clear that no allotment of praetorian provinces in 51 was attempted till the end of September. As there was probably some shortage of ex-consuls and ex-praetors qualified under the new law, and as there is reason to suppose that most provincial

commands in 51 began, like the consular, later than usual, it would have seemed a natural course to retain in their provinces all governors, consular and praetorian, throughout 50, and to make all provincial appointments for 49. This was at any rate Caesar's view and it seems to have been adopted with modifications by the senate in September. But there were two methods of carrying out this arrangement. (*a*) All provinces, consular and praetorian, might be settled together at the date when the Gauls could legally be considered, i.e. on March 1, 50[1]. This was what Caesar wished, because it was still possible that in a general debate on the provinces one or both of his provinces might be left out of the settlement, and consular and praetorian selected from the rest. (*b*) The praetorian provinces might be settled at once, either for the second half of 50, as Cicero of course would have preferred[2], or for 49. This was what the *optimates* wished, because it would be possible to make all provinces praetorian except those, e.g. the Gauls, which they intended to fix as consular on March 1, 50. It is in my opinion in the light of these two policies that the following passages of Caelius are to be explained. *Nosti enim haec tralaticia; de Galliis constituetur, erit qui intercedat; deinde alius exsistet qui, nisi libere liceat de omnibus provinciis decernere senatui, reliquas impediat* (ib. 8, 5, 2). *Ut video, causa haec integra in proximum annum transferetur; et quantum divino, relinquendus tibi erit qui provinciam obtineat* (because Cilicia is not likely to be made praetorian before 49). *Nam non expeditur successio, quoniam Galliae quae habent intercessorem in eandem condicionem quam ceterae provinciae vocantur* (8, 9, 2).

At the end of September, after many postponements, caused partly by Caesar's threat of *intercessio*, partly by Pompey's

[1] As with the defeat of Marcellus the *lex Sempronia* must by common consent have been given up, there was no constitutional reason for dealing with the two groups of provinces separately.

[2] Even if Cilicia and the eight praetorian provinces were to be filled from July 50 and not from Jan. 49, it would still be the case that the only provinces available as consular in 49 would be those not already fixed as praetorian. As a matter of fact, all existing governors had to remain till the beginning of 49.

uncertain attitude, the senatorial policy was embodied in several important decrees. (1) A meeting of the senate was to be called next year on March 1, by the consuls, C. Marcellus and Aemilius Paulus, to make a settlement *de provinciis consularibus*, which was to be debated day by day, and alone (*neve quid coniunctim*), i.e. without the praetorian. As this was the preclusive date fixed by the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*, the Gallic provinces would not be excluded from the debate, and it was no doubt intended to fix one or both of them as consular for 49, as M. Marcellus had vainly tried to do earlier in the year. As this was in perfect accordance with the agreement between Caesar and Pompey, no Caesarian tribune blocked this decree. But as the *lex Sempronia* was now assumed to be obsolete, and there might be some doubt about this, the magistrates of this or the following year were instructed *si quid de ea re lato opus esset*, to get the necessary sanction from the people[1]. (2) As the elimination of the *lex Sempronia* made the settlement of consular provinces liable to be blocked by *intercessio*, it was decreed that any tribune blocking the settlement to be arrived at next year, would be treated as acting *contra rempublicam*, a decree which might have consequences, but was more likely to be futile. (3) Contrary to Caesar's wish, that all the provinces should be decided together, a decree was now made about the praetorian provinces. Such a decree was abnormal because, as things had worked out, instead of the praetorian provinces being automatically settled by the previous selection of the consular, they were now to be selected first, so that the consular would necessarily be those not made praetorian, and not *vice versa*. Again, ostensibly the praetorian provinces for 50 were being fixed, but owing to the confusion and uncertainty caused by the *lex Pompeia* probably all provincial governorships in 51 began, like Cilicia and Syria, late in the year, so that practically, if not formally, it was for 49 that praetorian provinces were now assigned. The decree passed was that

[1] See above p. 178, n. 1. That this possible appeal to the people had reference to the present decree, and not to any decision to be made next year, is shown by the fact that the instruction is given primarily to the present magistrates and only on their failure to act, to those of next year.

Cilicia and the eight provinces held by ex-praetors should (i.e. when they fell vacant) be filled by ex-praetors of five, or failing them, of four or three years' standing. The result would be that, when March 1 arrived, and the consular provinces for 49 had to be fixed, only Syria and Caesar's two provinces would be available, and all hope that the latter might be left out of the distribution would be gone. It is no wonder therefore that this decree was blocked by Pansa's *intercessio*[1]. But though the question of praetorian provinces was hung up, it was open to the senate on the initiative of C. Marcellus and his colleague to settle the consular provinces on March 1, 50, the preclusive date of the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*. Unfortunately Caelius does not describe the meeting, but we know, explicitly from Suetonius and Appian, constructively from Cicero and Caelius, that it took place and that the contemplated decree was passed. What was it?

Appian (2, 27) says it was πέμπειν Καίσαρι διαδόχους ἐπὶ τὰ ἔθνη· καὶ γὰρ ἔληγεν ὁ χρόνος, but, as we have seen above, he did not understand this to mean immediate recall. Cicero (*ad Att.* 7, 7, 6) makes it clear that it was a decree *ut Caesari succederetur*, a decree which might have been made effective, if M. Marcellus had been supported. The s. c. of Sept. 29 proves beyond doubt that the only question before the senate on March 1 could have been *de provinciis consularibus*. Lastly, as that s. c. was passed in consequence of Pompey's expressed wish, *eum post Kal. Mart. decedere*, the effect of the proposal made by Marcellus on March 1, 50, must have been for Caesar to be superseded on March 1, 49[2]. We have already seen that there was only one way of bringing this about, viz. by making his provinces consular on the date of his intended recall. This is what *ut Caesari succederetur* had meant in 56, and the conjunction now of the same phrase with *de provinciis consularibus* in the s. c. makes its meaning certain. The proposal therefore

[1] The decrees, with others less essential, are given in *ad fam.* 8, 8, 5—8. The blocking of the last decree made it certain that Cicero would not be relieved at the end of his year, and as a matter of fact no governors appointed in 51 were relieved till the beginning of 49 (Caes. *b. c.* 1, 6).

[2] I reserve a full examination of the phrase *post Kal. Mart. decedere* for the section on Pompey's attitude.

of C. Marcellus was that the consular provinces for 49 should be either the two Gauls from March 1 or Transalpine Gaul from that date and Syria from Jan. 1. In the latter case, Cisalpine Gaul would have been afterwards assigned with the praetorian provinces, though not available till March 1. If this decree had not been vetoed, and if the supplementary step of selecting qualified successors and sending them out had been taken, Caesar would have found himself a *privatus* on March 1, 49.

On the other hand, Hirschfeld (pp. 82 and 86) and apparently Judeich[1] regard the proposal of Marcellus *ut Caesari succederetur* as one for immediate recall on or shortly after March 1, 50. I shall come to closer grips with the latter in a later section, and I will only point out here that if Caesar's legal term extended till Dec. 29, 50, the only logical explanation of Marcellus' proposal is that it was to render possible in the proper way his actual supersession on that date. Judeich is cut off from this explanation by his reference of *post Kal. Mart. decedere* to the year 50, so that he is compelled to adopt, as in the case of the proposal in 51, what I venture to call the irrational view that Marcellus proposed by senatorial decree to deprive Caesar of ten months' command legally conferred upon him by the people.

Hirschfeld's position is different, but hardly more logical. He does not pretend that March 1, 50, was the *legis dies* in the sense of being the legal termination of the command, but merely in the sense that it was the only time limit specified in the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*. Originally, as preclusive, it was in Caesar's interest, indirectly guaranteeing his position till the senate was allowed to discuss it. Moreover, as long as the *lex Sempronia* was in force, no decree resulting from the discussion could make Caesar's provinces consular before 48. But when Pompey's law had abrogated the *lex Sempronia*, the preclusive date became permissive in the sense that the senate, in the absence of any other legal limit, could at once supersede

[1] The proposals of the two Marcelli, involving, as they both do, the inconvenient date, March 1, do not interest Judeich very much, and he steers clear of them as much as he can.

Caesar by sending out successors forthwith, this being the meaning of *ut Caesari succedatur*.

Now (1) the only way of superseding or 'succeeding' Caesar, whether there was a legal term or not, was to make his provinces consular (or perhaps praetorian) from a fixed date. (2) The only difference made by the abrogation of the *lex Sempronia* was that on March 1, 50, the senate could make Caesar's provinces either consular or praetorian for 49 instead of for 48. To suppose that with the passing of the *lex Pompeia* or the abrogation of the *lex Sempronia* all rule and custom with regard to provincial appointments were cancelled, and that provinces could be declared consular and filled on the same day, is preposterous, and disproved in the case of praetorian provinces by the inoperative decree of Sept. 51. (3) Even if the course ascribed to Marcellus and the senate had been permissible, it would in the particular case have been impossible. Caesar's province could not be made consular on March 1, and he could not therefore be replaced by successors on that date, for the sufficient reason that there were already two consular provinces, Cilicia and Syria, which would not be vacant till June or July at the earliest.

Hirschfeld's whole position depends upon juggling with the phrases *tempus legis* and *festgesetzte Termin*; *denn dass sich ein solcher darin* (in the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*) *befand, ist an und für sich nicht zu bezweifel* (pp. 83—4). If, when Cicero said in Dec. *praeteriit tempus legis*, he referred to March, 1, 50, he must have regarded it as the legal termination of Caesar's command[1]. Hirschfeld does not pretend that it was[2]. It was only a preclusive or permissive date, and this could only be

[1] Hirschfeld strangely overlooks the point that in Cicero's eyes *tempus libidinis tuae* was more correct than *tempus legis*. The *tempus legis* therefore was self-imposed by Caesar himself. I leave it to Hirschfeld's supporters to decide whether this suits best March 1, 50, or March 1, 49.

[2] If Hirschfeld is determined to make March 1, 50, the *legis dies*, I wonder that he does not more boldly adopt Dio's statement that the legal end was in 50, and explain it by making the second *quinquennium* date from the passing of *lex Pompeia-Licinia*, presumably on March 1, 55. This would mean the withdrawal of several ill-considered judgements, and would be vulnerable at many points, but it would at least be logical.

the actual termination, if the senate was able to use the permission effectively on that day. The real *Termin* of the command, whether described as *legis dies* or not, would be the day on which the senate succeeded in doing this, and was therefore not a *festgesetzte Termin.*

We shall take it therefore that on March 1 or one of the following days the senate passed a decree, declaring the Gallic provinces (or perhaps one of them, the other to be settled later) consular from March 1, 49, after which date Caesar would be *privatus.* This was not contrary to the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*, but it was a violation of the understanding made at Luca, which Caesar was still determined, if possible by constitutional means, to maintain. The *lex Sempronia* being out of force, there was no constitutional reason why Curio should not block the decree by his *intercessio*, and it is clear from *ad fam.* 9, 13, 2 and *ad Att.* 7, 7, 5 that he took this course. Provision had been made in Sept. against the possibility of this in the second of the decrees then passed, and the senate by bold action might, as Cicero believed, and as it actually did in the following Jan., have made its decree effective[1]. As a matter of fact however Curio maintained his *intercessio*, and threatened to use it against all compromises, so that the decree remained ineffective till the end of the year.

At what point Curio first made his suggestion that Pompey and Caesar should both resign together (i.e as I understand it on March 1, 49) is not clear. In representing it as Curio's reply to the decree of March 1, Hirschfeld is following Appian (2, 24), one of those late writers, the acceptance of whose statements marks, in his opinion, incompetence to weigh evidence. At any rate, the daring proposal, carried, apparently late in the year, by a huge majority (App. 2, 30), was merely a piece of futile imbecility into which Curio trapped the senate, and as it contained no settlement with regard to either Caesar's provinces or Pompey's, it had no relation to the question *de successione.*

[1] The moves and counter moves of the year, including the compromise *ut Idibus Novembribus decedat*, I shall deal with in the section on Pompey's position. I am only concerned here with the technical question *de successione.*

That question might have dawdled on, as Caelius wrote in 51 (8, 5, 2), *plus biennium*, but for Caesar's ultimatum at the beginning of 49. The senate, realising the alternative, *depugnandum est aut habenda e lege ratio*, replied by a decree, *uti ante certam diem Caesar exercitum dimittat ; si non faciat, eum adversus rem publicam facturum videri* (*b. c.* 1, 1). This was not an act of *successio*, but a counter ultimatum, intended perhaps to clear the way for the only step by which Caesar could be formally superseded. It at any rate had that effect, for it provoked the *intercessio* of the Caesarian tribunes, who were then dealt with as Marcellus would have dealt with Curio ten months earlier. The last decree was passed, and the tribunes fled from Rome. Their departure removed the deadlock of the past ten months, and the senate in a subsequent meeting proceeded to the *successio provinciarum*, including those of Caesar. It was decreed that Further Gaul and Syria should be consular provinces, while Cisalpine Gaul was one of the praetorian, the respective governors being Ahenobarbus, Scipio and Nonianus (*b. c.* 1, 6, *ad fam.* 16, 12, 3). In one respect only were these decrees irregular, viz. that the provinces were fixed as consular and praetorian simultaneously or almost simultaneously[1] with the appointment and despatch of the new governors, a course which I have argued could not have been taken in March 50. It was excused now by the emergencies of what was already practically a state of civil war. At the same time, unless Caesar acted as an enemy, his legal term was not to be cut short. The *certa dies* of the ultimatum was the real *festgesetzte Termin* the *legis dies*, March 1, and Ahenobarbus and Nonianus would only succeed on that date. Thus even after the crossing of the Rubicon, when negotiations for avoiding war were again pending, Caesar was required to return in *provinciam*, an indication that his term had not yet expired (*b. c.* 1, 11), and it is not till the late summer, when March 1 was a date of the past, that Caesar can talk of *abductum exercitum*.

[1] Apart from civil war, Caesar's successors would still not be sent out till March 1, but on crossing the Rubicon his status as governor was gone.

III. Caesar's second consulship and the tribunician law.

It was at Luca that arrangements were made for the second consulship of Pompey and Crassus and for the future position of Caesar. It may be regarded therefore as certain that his own second consulship was also provided for. The year fixed for it was 48, (*a*) because the five years' extension of his command made an earlier year impossible; and (*b*) because Caesar thought it convenient and advisable to conform to Sulla's law requiring an interval of 10 years after his first consulship in 59. That he made a point and a merit of this conformity, is shown by his own words in *b. c.* 1, 32: *docet se nullum extraordinarium honorem appetere, sed exspectato legitimo tempore consulatus eo fuisse contentum.* The same conclusion must be drawn from Dio, 40, 51, who says that the *absentis ratio* was to be allowed ὅταν ἐκ τῶν νόμων καθήκῃ. But if the consulship for 48 was agreed upon at Luca, it cannot be doubted that an understanding was also arrived at that Caesar should stand for it in his absence, and so be enabled to take advantage of the existing regulations, and retain his provinces till entering on the office, since it was well known that the *optimates* would impeach him for the irregular acts of his first consulship the moment he became a *privatus* (Suet. *Iul.* 30). No steps however were taken at once to secure this privilege, since there was plenty of time, and Caesar would naturally not wish to disclose his full hand.

But in 52, when Pompey was made sole consul, and his attitude towards Caesar had become at least ambiguous, we may assume that the latter claimed the carrying out of the understanding as to his canvass in absence. Pompey, who within his own limitations was a man of honour, allowed and perhaps even initiated the law of the ten tribunes. Among the many statements as to this law, the following of Cicero is as explicit as any. Pompey in his third consulship *contendit ut decem tribuni pl. ferrent ut absentis ratio haberetur, quod idem ipse sanxit lege quadam sua* (*ad Att.* 8, 3, 3: conf. ib. 7, 3, 4; Liv. *epit.* 107 and 108; Caes. *b. c.* 1, 9; Suet. *Iul.* 26,

where the privilege is to be used *quandoque imperi tempus expleri coepisset*; App. 2, 20; D. C. 40, 51).

A question arises whether this exemption was still uncancelled at the end of 50, when it seemed likely to be of vital importance for Caesar's position. We know that it was jeopardised by Pompey's *lex de iure magistratuum*, which contained a clause, ostensibly perhaps tralatician, κελεύοντα τοὺς ἀρχήν τινα ἐπαγγέλλοιτας ἐς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν πάντως ἀπαντᾶν, ὥστε μηδένα ἀπόντα αἱρεῖσθαι (D. C. 40, 56). It appears however from Dio, Suetonius (c. 28) and Cicero (*ad Att.* 8, 3, 3) that Pompey had in some way, though according to Suetonius after his own law had been engraved, corrected the 'oversight' and legalised Caesar's right. Marcellus in 51 must have taken this view, since Suetonius says: *rettulit ne absentis ratio comitiis haberetur,...quando nec plebiscito Pompeius postea abrogasset.* The epitomator agrees with this: *agente in senatu M. Marcello ut Caesar in petitionem consulatus veniret, cum is lege lata in id tempus consulatus provinciam obtinere deberet.* Cicero too in several passages, but very forcibly in *ad fam.* 6, 6, 5, implies the continued validity of the law: *rationem absentis haberi non tam pugnavi ut liceret, quam ut, quoniam ipso consule pugnante populus iusserat, haberetur.*

It seems important to establish two points about this law. (1) It limited the privilege to a particular year, viz. 49, and could not have enabled Caesar to stand in his absence either before or after that year. This is not only indicated by the words of Dio Cassius already cited, ὅταν ἐκ τῶν νόμων καθήκῃ, but from Caesar's own words (*b. c.* 1, 9), *cuius absentis rationem haberi proximis comitiis populus iussisset.* It is indeed inconceivable either that such an exemption would have been granted for an undefined year, or that Pompey, who was in a sense responsible for the law, or Caelius Rufus, who knew all that was going on, would have been under any misapprehension on this point. Hirschfeld however strangely interprets several statements of Caelius as showing that both he and Pompey were under the impression that Caesar thought of standing at the elections in 50 for the consulship of 49

(*Klio*, v, p. 240). (*a*) Early in Sept. 51 Caelius writes (*ad fam.* 8, 9, 5) that Pompey will clearly not allow Caesar to retain his command and to be consul designate. (The reading is slightly corrupt, but the sense is clear.) He was however not prepared to recommend any decree on the matter at present. This only shows what is clear from other evidence, that the situation threatened in 49 was already occupying attention in 51. (*b*) In Oct. 51, after enumerating the decrees passed on Sept. 29, and recording Pompey's promise to take up a definite line against Caesar after March 1 next, Caelius adds (8, 8, 9): *Itaque iam, ut video, alteram utram in condicionem descendere vult Caesar, ut aut maneat neque hoc anno ratio sua habeatur, aut, si designatus esse poterit, decedat.* Caelius is obviously making a forecast of his own as to Caesar's probable course, and he is certainly wrong in supposing that he would resign after being elected, since his one aim was to leave no interval in which he would be *privatus*. But Caelius could not be wrong about the year of Caesar's candidature. It was the year on which all eyes were centred, the year which in particular he and Cicero were always discussing, as that in which Caesar's legal term would expire, and which could not but be specified in the tribunician law. Neither for Cicero nor for any one else could there be the smallest ambiguity as to the identity of *hoc anno*, and it speaks little for Hirschfeld's power of weighing evidence that he should seriously adduce the *ipse dixit* of 'his friend, Bardt' as decisive that *hoc anno* can only be the electoral year in which Caelius was writing. (*c*) In a letter written in May 50 (*ad fam.* 8, 11, 3) Caelius, after mentioning a suggestion believed to be favoured by Pompey that Caesar should be recalled 'on Nov. 13,' concludes a passage, to be discussed elsewhere, by saying of Pompey: *valde autem non vult et plane timet Caesarem cos. design. prius quam exercitum et provinciam tradiderit.* Hirschfeld denies that this can refer to Nov. 49, because Pompey's dislike and fear of the *absentis ratio* is inconsistent with his allowing it by letting Caesar stay till Nov. But on the assumption that Pompey mistook the year of Caesar's intended *ratio*, precisely the same difficulty would arise on referring the Nov. to 50.

When does Hirschfeld suppose that Pompey recognised the truth? He will hardly deny that he had done so in Sept. 50, when, according to Caelius, Pompey is using precisely the same language, two months after the elections of 50, as he had used a year before: *constituit Pompeius non pati Caesarem aliter consulem fieri, nisi exercitum et provincias tradiderit.* Hirschfeld's motive in attributing this mistake to Pompey and Caelius is obvious, for, if Caesar's legal term extended to March 49, they could never have been so simple as to believe that he would voluntarily curtail it.

(2) The second point to be established about the *absentis ratio* is its precise scope and effect. Its object was not to extend Caesar's command or to enable him to retain it after the legal term had expired. For it must be remembered that, when the tribunician law was passed, Caesar could already count on retaining his position till the end of 49 owing to the joint effect of the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*, the provincial regulations of Sulla, and the operation of the *lex Sempronia.* But Caesar desired more than this; he desired for the sake of his own safety to step direct from his provincial command into the consulship at the beginning of 48, and as a personal canvass in the summer of 49 would mean the relinquishment of his *imperium*, the *absentis ratio* was the indispensable condition of the last *semenstre imperium* of 49. When Caesar complains to the senate in Jan. 49 (*b. c.* 1, 9), *quod populi Romani beneficium sibi per contumeliam ab inimicis extorqueretur, ereptoque semenstri imperio ad urbem retraheretur, cuius absentis rationem haberi proximis comitiis populus iussisset*, and when the epitomator (108) says that he had the right, *lege lata in tempus consulatus provinciam obtinere*, the reference is merely to the indirect result originally aimed at by the tribunician law. The law in itself said nothing of *imperium*, or army or provinces, but, as all the evidence shows, was merely *ut absentis ratio haberetur.*

That object was thwarted by the *lex Pompeia de iure magistratuum*, which, though it did not invalidate the tribunician law, might easily make it useless to Caesar. To assert with Hirschfeld (p. 85) that after 52 Caesar was compelled to

fall back on the tribunician law, or with Rice Holmes (p. 50) that that law implied a right on Caesar's part to retain his province till at least July, is to misunderstand the situation. It was possible now to make Caesar a *privatus* after March 1, 49 (on Hirschfeld's view, much earlier), and if that was done, though he might still claim the *absentis ratio*, he would have to use it as a *privatus* and practically as an exile, and not as the governor of the Gallic provinces. I venture to lay it down as incontrovertible that whatever interval there was between the *legis dies*, whether March 1, 50, or Dec. 29, 50, or March 1, 49, and the consular elections, was incapable of being bridged by the tribunician law. An appeal is sometimes made to Cicero's words in *ad Att.* 7, 7, 6, as proving that the retention of the army was sanctioned by the grant of the *absentis ratio*. *Exercitum retinentis, cum legis dies transierit, rationem haberi placet? Mihi vero ne absentis quidem. Sed cum hoc datum est, illud una datum est.* But Cicero's point merely is that the danger should have been foreseen when the law was passed, since at that time the *absentis ratio* involved, as it was meant to do, the *exercitum retinentis ratio*.

But, it may be asked, how is the fact to be explained that at the close of 50 the struggle between Caesar and the senate seems to be concentrated round the privilege of the *absentis ratio*? Why does the former so insist upon it—*habe rationem meam*—and why are his opponents so outraged at his impudence in doing so? The answer is simple. Caesar had not given up the programme agreed upon at Luca, which was indeed more essential to his safety now than it had seemed then, of retaining his command till the end of 49, and only resigning it for the consulship. The retention of his command beyond March 1, though no longer secured by legal safeguards, might still be compassed without violating the constitution, but it would be a mere postponement of the danger without the consulship at the end, and this was as completely dependent now as before 52 on the *absentis ratio*. It was therefore a crucial point for Caesar, and if for Caesar, then for his adversaries also.

The privilege of canvassing in absence was not one which

the senate could allow or withhold, since its legal conferment by the people was obviously not disputed, and if Caesar still found himself in possession of his provinces in July, nothing could prevent its exercise. But there was an awkward gap between March 1, *cum legis dies transierit*, and the elections, and it was the question of this gap which agitated political circles at the end of Dec. 50. If the senate could effectively make Caesar's provinces consular or praetorian, and be ready to send out successors, Caesar would be *privatus* after March 1, and the *absentis ratio*, though not disallowed, would be useless to him. Up to Dec. he had prevented the necessary steps from being taken by the constitutional method of tribunician *intercessio*, and it was the possibility that he might maintain his position even after March 1, either by the same tactics or by diplomatic persuasion (*vel per senatum vel per tribunos*), which so excited Cicero in his letters to Atticus. As matters stood, there was only one way in which Caesar could be deprived of the *absentis ratio*, and that was by either compelling the withdrawal of the *intercessio*, or in the last resort quashing it by the last decree. Whether it would have taken this course which, as Cicero realised, practically meant civil war, but for Caesar's unexpected ultimatum on Jan. 1, it is impossible to say, but at any rate, when it was taken, and the Gallic provinces duly assigned to successors after March 1, Caesar recognised that the *absentis ratio* was of no use to him, and it is this which explains his subsequent suggestion that, if Pompey would go to Spain, *ad consulatus petitionem se venturum, neque iam se velle absente se rationem haberi suam; se praesentem trinum nundinum petiturum* (*ad fam.* 16, 12, 3).

One more point may be cleared up. It has been argued that, even if Caesar had been allowed to remain (or more correctly, had succeeded through his obstruction in remaining) till July, and had been designated consul in his absence, he would have been no more entitled than before to remain till the end of the year. That is perfectly true, but Caesar's election, while still governor, being due to the want of vigorous action by the senate, would considerably strengthen his position, and weaken that of the senate, and continued obstruction

during the last six months of the year would have been rendered easier by its success in the first six. Thus Caesar's chances of getting the last *semenstre imperium* would have been very favourable, since, as Caelius had said in 50, want of courage on the part of the senate would mean that *Caesar quoad volet manebit* (*ad fam.* 8, 11, 3).

IV. The attitude of Pompey towards Caesar's command.

As Hirschfeld and to a certain extent Judeich claim to find support for their theories as to the legal termination of Caesar's command in Pompey's attitude, as indicated both by the general situation and by certain passages in Cicero's correspondence, it will be as well to examine this aspect of the question with some minuteness.

It can hardly be denied that up to 56 Pompey's position in the coalition had been a secondary one, that his enforced activity in Rome was uncongenial, and that he was anxious for a position more commensurate with that of Caesar. In the first half of 56 two incidents, in neither of which Pompey was directly concerned, convinced Caesar that the security of his own position called for some reconstruction of the coalition. The first incident was the ill-advised attempt of Cicero to give effect to the view of strict constitutionalists that Caesar's agrarian law was a *lex vitiosa*. The second was the design to fix, in accordance with the *lex Sempronia*, one or both of the Gauls as consular provinces for 54, and when Caesar should thus have become a *privatus* at the end of his five years, to impeach him for the acts of his consulship (Suet. *Iul.* 24 and 30). These were the occasions for the conference of Luca, at which it is clear from Suetonius and Appian that Caesar was the dominant figure[1].

That he had been the dominant partner in the coalition for the past three years and a half, cannot be doubted, and

[1] I have already alluded to Dio's demonstrably incorrect version, in which the meeting at Luca is ignored, and Pompey and Crassus are represented as acting independently of Caesar.

there seems no reason why at this point he should have adopted the principle, attributed to him by Judeich, of 'equal rights for all.' But no doubt the immediate securities which he desired for his own position as well as future acquiescence in it on the part of his allies had to be purchased, and Caesar was prepared to relinquish the sole military headship of the coalition by conceding to both his partners a parallel provincial command. Hence it was agreed that Crassus should have a command in Syria and Pompey one in the two Spains for five years[1]. To carry out this arrangement, as well as to establish Caesar's own position, Pompey and Crassus were to hold the consulship in 55, thus disposing of the threatening and inconvenient candidature of Ahenobarbus.

The legal termination of Pompey's command of the Spanish provinces was not a factor in the problem presented at the end of 50, because by its uncovenanted extension in 52 it would have outlasted Caesar's, and even Caesar's second consulship, by several years. But at the conference of Luca it was not without its importance. According to Judeich (*Rhein. Mus.* 1913, p. 4) there can be no doubt that Pompey and Crassus entered on their provincial command in the normal way after their consulship, i.e. on Jan. 1, 54. I should have thought on the contrary, remembering the precedent of the *lex Vatinia*, and the fact that Pompey and Crassus desired the consulship mainly as a means of securing their own military position, that the necessary laws would have been passed early in the year, and that their provincial *imperium* would have begun, like Caesar's, at once. This supposition is confirmed by the fact that Crassus not only collected his forces while still consul, but actually left Rome *paludatus* for the East in the middle of November (*ad Att.* 4, 13, 2). Judeich is anxious to show, as we shall see, that Pompey's command was timed to expire on Dec. 29, 50, but he seems to have overlooked the fact, that

[1] The *quinquennium* of Pompey and Crassus depends on the same writers of the imperial age (with Dio thrown in) whose evidence as to Caesar's second five years Hirschfeld sweeps aside. It is curious, but characteristic, that he should only reject that part of their evidence which conflicts with his own preconceived hypothesis.

his actual, though not his legal, term would end on that date, even if his five years began in March or April 55. As the Sullan regulations were still in force, no successor could take his place when the legal term ended, and he would remain in command, whether in Rome or in Spain, till two of the praetors of 50 succeeded him on Jan. 1, 49, this being the extreme limit of his *imperium*, as depending on the *lex Trebonia*[1]. Of course his own *lex de iure magistratuum* would have made it possible to recall Pompey at the end of his legal term, but neither that law nor the extension of his command for a second *quinquennium* was foreseen at Luca.

But what were the arrangements made for Caesar's benefit? Their practical effect is not disputed by either Hirschfeld or Judeich. It was that Caesar should be enabled to retain his provinces till the end of 49. His two essential requirements were (*a*) ample time to complete his military and political work in Gaul, and (*b*) the avoidance of an interval during which, as *privatus*, he would be liable to the impeachment which men like Ahenobarbus and Cato openly threatened. His only goal of safety was a second consulship, and it cannot be doubted that this was arranged for him, but in accordance with the Sullan requirement of a ten years' interval, and therefore not till 48. The question is how the interval between March 1, 54, up to which the *lex Vatinia* secured him, and the end of 49 was guaranteed.

In the first place, we may assume that what was at the time a minor point, though circumstances lent it a factitious importance at a later stage permission to stand for the consul-

[1] Dr Rice Holmes suggests that, as the *lex Sempronia* was in force, Pompey probably inserted in the *lex Trebonia* a clause similar to that in the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*, making it possible for him to retain his provinces till the end of 49. We have no right to assume this without evidence, and it seems to me unlikely. In the first place, it would mean the retention of his command eighteen months at least after the legal term, whereas Caesar would only have had ten months extra. In the second place, it assumes that Pompey's provinces would be made, one or both, consular, whereas both the Spains, even the more important, Further Spain, were usually praetorian, and in that case, Pompey could not expect to remain after the end of 50, when praetors of that year could succeed him.

ship without abandoning his command by returning in the summer of 49, was arranged to be secured at the proper time. It was an essential part of the scheme, and could not possibly have been overlooked. Another point on which there is no dispute is that skilful use was made of the *lex Sempronia de provinciis consularibus.* It was certain that Transalpine Gaul at least, when vacated by Caesar, would have to be a consular province, and would therefore by the terms of this law definitely have to be fixed as such before the election of the consul who would hold it (Sall. *Iug.* 27). In order to make sure therefore that no ex-consul could be assigned to it or to Cisalpine Gaul before 48, steps were to be taken to make illegal the fixing of either of Caesar's provinces as consular before March 1, 50. Such a legal prohibition against applying the *lex Sempronia* to Caesar's *successio* till 50, meant that he could be superseded at earliest by one of the consuls of 49 at the beginning of 48. But Caesar was not likely to be content with such negative protection. He naturally required a law definitely extending his command, and as a matter of fact, this preclusive stipulation was to be nothing more than a clause in such a law.

It might of course have been arranged for this law to extend Caesar's command up to the end of 49, and this would have made his position legally unassailable. But such an unsymmetrical extension of five years and ten months would inevitably have disclosed what was almost certainly the secret arrangement, that Caesar was to step straight from his provincial post into a second consulship. Besides, it was not necessary, and the more obvious and regular course of granting a second *quinquennium,* i.e. to March 1, 49, would perfectly meet the case. For as long as the Sullan system was in force, even *cum legis dies transierit,* Caesar could not be replaced till the end of the year, there being the same obstacle to a consul of 50 succeeding him on March 1, 49 as, according to Cicero, there would have been to a consul of 55 succeeding him on March 1, 54.

In Caesar's interest therefore, and I insist that this was the dominant factor at Luca, a five years' extension was the

sufficient and obvious course, since it carried with it an extension to the end of the year, an extension also guaranteed, for the sake of double security, by the non-applicability of the *lex Sempronia* to Caesar's provinces till March 1, 50. Now it is precisely such a five years' legal extension to which all the ancient authorities, as we have seen, except Dio Cassius testify, and few will disagree with the remark of Dr Rice Holmes that in default of very strong counter-evidence their testimony must stand.

This at least is admitted by Judeich, who nevertheless for the flimsiest reasons argues that the legal termination of the second *quinquennium* was the last day of Dec. 50. His particular arguments, derived from passages of Cicero's correspondence written in that year, I postpone to their proper place, but the general justification of his position, based on his view of the situation at Luca, must be dealt with here.

Ignoring the evidence of Suetonius and Appian as to the antecedents of the conference, and taking no account of the threatened attack on Caesar's position by Cicero's motion on the Campanian land question, and by the plan for recalling him in 54, Judeich seems to regard the meeting at Luca as due to something like a revolt on the part of Pompey and Crassus. In accordance with this view, Caesar's primary aim is represented as not the securing of an impregnable position for himself, but the conciliation of a discontented Pompey and a sulky Crassus by the concession of the principle 'equal rights for all[1].' Not only so, but he was willing, no doubt in the hope of ultimate advantage to himself, to soothe Pompey's vanity by accepting less, as the result of immediate legislation, than he might have fairly claimed. According to the principle of 'equal rights for all,' each of the three was to have a second consulship and a quinquennial command. But, while Pompey and Crassus were to have their consulship at once, Caesar was content to wait seven years for his. Again, while an extension

[1] The view that Pompey and Crassus were in revolt against Caesar receives no support except from Dio, whose presentation of the situation is wholly vitiated by his ignorance that any conference was held at all.

of five years to his own command would mean its extension to March 1, 49, he was content to sacrifice two months of his command by allowing its legal termination to be fixed for Dec. 29, 50, because that was the date on which the five years of Pompey and Crassus would come to an end, and it would have given too much offence to allow his own term to extend beyond theirs.

This explanation, so far from being convincing, seems to me unsound at every point. (1) If it is a question of the legal termination of Caesar's command as compared with that of Pompey and Crassus, Judeich, as we have seen, has no right to assume that the precedent of the *lex Vatinia* was departed from, and that the *lex Trebonia* fixed the commencement of the commands not at once, but at the end of the year, an assumption made improbable by the fact that Crassus left Rome in the middle of November. It is far more likely that the five years for which Syria and the Spanish provinces were granted would legally terminate at some date in the first half of 50. (2) But, even if Caesar had consented to allow his *quinquennium* to be cut short by two months so as to coincide with the end of Pompey's term, would the latter have been so simple as to regard this as a case of equal rights as between himself and Caesar? Whether Dec. 29, 50, was the legal end of his *quinquennium*, or, as is more probable, the end of the year in which his *quinquennium* would expire, and so by the Sullan regulations the actual limit of his command, it was in either case, in the absence of further legislation, a date beyond which no extension was possible. On the other hand, as Judeich himself admits, the sole object of the clause in the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*, prohibiting Caesar's *successio* till March 50, was to make it certain that his *quinquennium*, whenever ending, would be practically prolonged till the end of 49. Pompey therefore could have been under no illusions, and unless he already meditated the disloyalty of which he was afterwards guilty, he must at Luca have been prepared not only to see Caesar retain his command twelve months after his own had expired, but to face the possibilities of Caesar's second consulship in 48. (3) Judeich seems to overlook the fact that Caesar,

in this vain attempt to conciliate or delude Pompey, would have sacrificed much more than two months of his full *quinquennium*. The full *quinquennium* would under the existing Sullan system have made it impossible for a successor to replace him before Jan. 1, 48, whereas, if Judeich is right, he laid himself open to be superseded on Jan. 1, 49. Is this what Judeich is thinking of when he declares that it was as a set-off to the sacrifice of two months that Caesar insisted on the clause already referred to being inserted in the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*? But (*a*) such a set-off would have been a flagrant violation of the supposed principle of 'equal rights for all,' for instead of the two months sacrificed, it not only restored them in another form, but added the last ten months of the year as well. (*b*) The use made of the *lex Sempronia*, bound up as it was with the only constitutional method of *successio*, could not have been a mere after-thought, but must have been an essential part of Caesar's scheme. With it and the full *quinquennium* he had a double security. By the former his provinces could not be assigned to the consuls of any year earlier than 49; by the latter, even if they were assigned to the consuls of 50, such assignment would be inoperative for the reasons given by Cicero, when the question arose in 56. If Caesar had voluntarily relinquished, as Judeich supposes, this second guarantee, he would have allowed his whole case to rest on the *sanctio* in the law of Pompey and Crassus, and if this had been disregarded, as similar 'sanctions' often were, and as Marcellus actually tried to disregard it in 51, he would have had to resign his provinces to the consuls of 50. Of course, as the result of the changed situation after 52, Caesar lost both guarantees, but that does not make it easier to believe with Judeich that at the very moment in 56, when he was realising the bar offered by the Sullan system to his recall in March 54, he would of his own accord have renounced the similar advantage which the same system might give him in 49. If Judeich had been a little less anxious to establish a new theory independent alike of Mommsen and Hirschfeld, he might have examined the situation, as it presented itself at Luca, somewhat more carefully, instead of resting his whole

position, as he virtually does, on a single phrase of Cicero, *praeteriit tempus legis*, written at the end of 50[1].

A bolder, but not more logical, theory is put forward by Hirschfeld. Rejecting the consensus of authorities for a second *quinquennium*, he supposes that the arrangement made at Luca and carried out by the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*, was that Caesar's command should be prorogued from March 1, 54 without any specified time limit, but should be indirectly confirmed up to March 1, 50 by a clause making it illegal to fix Caesar's provinces as consular before that date. But as, while the *lex Sempronia* was in force, no decision taken on that day by the senate could bring Caesar's command to a termination before the last day of 49, he could count on retaining his provinces up to that date. No real *legis dies* therefore was fixed either at Luca or by the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*, for March 1, 50 was merely the date on which the senate might take the preliminary step towards recalling Caesar, and even Dec. 29, 49 could only be regarded as the *legis dies* conditionally on the senate taking that step.

With the inconsistencies in connexion with the phrase *legis dies* in which Hirschfeld's theory inevitably lands him, I have already dealt. The question here is whether such an arrangement could have commended itself to Caesar at Luca. Hirschfeld suggests that he would have preferred it to a definite five years' extension, because the latter would have implied that that time was likely to be required for the conquest of Gaul, while this arrangement might suggest a speedier termination of the war. (*Klio* IV, p. 87.) This might have been so, if March 1, 50 could be regarded as even a possible termination of the command, but by a strange con-

[1] I have already dealt with this passage, and also pointed out that Judeich's theory is absolutely irreconcilable both with Pompey's view that Caesar should be recalled *post Kal. Martias* (*ad fam.* 8, 8, 4), and with Cicero's statement (*ad Att.* 8, 3, 3) that Marcellus wished to limit his command *Kalendarum Martiarum die*. If these dates refer to 50, Judeich is committed to the impossible view that Pompey and Marcellus thought of depriving Caesar of ten months' command legally conferred by the people. We shall see later that his interpretation of *ad fam.* 8, 11, 3 involves the same irrational hypothesis.

fusion of thought Hirschfeld forgets that even on his own theory it was only after Pompey's law of 52 and the consequent abrogation of the *lex Sempronia* that the possibility of ending it so soon could have presented itself, whereas he professes to be discussing Caesar's calculations in 56.

But a more important consideration is whether the vague arrangement supposed by Hirschfeld would have satisfied Caesar. It in fact gave him no security at all if the 'sanction' forbidding action by the senate till March 50 was disregarded. The *lex Pompeia-Licinia*, on Hirschfeld's view, simply continued Caesar's command till it was terminated by the senate's action as limited by the *lex Sempronia*, that action being prohibited till a certain date. But for a single prohibiting clause the senate might have taken action in the summer of 54 or of 53 or of 52, in which case Caesar might have been superseded at the beginning of 52 or 51 or 50. Caesar's whole position in a word would have hung on the observance of this one clause, an observance which the attempt of Marcellus in 51 proves to have been precarious.

Viewed therefore from the point of view of Caesar's interests at Luca and the relation in which Pompey stood to him in 56, the hypotheses both of Judeich and Hirschfeld fail to satisfy the conditions of a convincing explanation of the problem. We will therefore, in considering the land-marks of the question from this point, start from the assumption, favoured by the ancient historians, that a second *quinquennium* was to be granted to Caesar, and that it was to terminate on March 1, 49.

The programme was duly carried out by the legislation of 55, the *lex Pompeia-Licinia* containing the stipulated clause, that Caesar's provinces should not be discussed in connexion with the *lex Sempronia* before March 1, 50[1]. The proof of this last point is found in the fact that in 51 Marcellus acted *ante tempus* and *contra legem Pompei et Crassi*, taken in combination with Pompey's own statement made in Sept. of the

[1] On the supposition that both Gauls could have been made praetorian, Caesar was protected from being superseded in 49, not by the *lex Sempronia*, but only by the Sullan system of provincial succession. As a matter of fact however, Transalpine Gaul was bound to be consular.

same year, *se ante Kal. Mart. non posse sine iniuria de provinciis Caesaris statuere* (*ad fam.* 8, 8, 9). The public could of course draw its own inferences from this arrangement, but I suggest that Caesar's second consulship, and with it of course the *absentis ratio*, were for the present kept in the background. In the following years various causes produced a growing estrangement between Pompey and Caesar, the first discordant note being probably due to the fact of Pompey remaining in Rome instead of going out to Spain. That Caesar had resented this is indicated by his own words, *in se novi generis imperia constitui, ut idem ad portas urbanis praesideat rebus et duas bellicosissimas provincias absens tot annos obtineat* (*b. c.* 1, 85). Nothing critical however happened till 52, when Pompey, contrary to the *lex Cornelia*, carefully observed by Caesar, became consul for the third time, and without a colleague. As this irregular appointment was favoured by Cato and Bibulus, and as the senate had already in the previous year passed a decree providing for a five years' interval between a magistracy and a provincial command (Dio Cass. 40, 46), it seems probable that Pompey was pledged to the *optimates* to confirm this decree by legislation (id. 40, 56). At any rate Caesar thought it time definitely to pave the way for his second consulship as a direct continuation of his provincial position by securing legal permission to stand in the summer of 49 in his absence. The permission was granted by a tribunician law with Pompey's consent, a sure indication that it had been stipulated for at Luca. This law, as we have seen, in spite of Pompey's ambiguous action later in the year and its attempted annulment by Marcellus in 51, was recognised by Cicero as still in force at the end of 50.

But the *lex Pompeia de iure magistratuum* changed the whole situation, and destroyed the continuity of Caesar's position which it had been the object of the arrangements at Luca to secure. It did not indeed violate the letter of the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*, or curtail the second *quinquennium* granted by that law. But it violated the spirit of the clause so often referred to, which, with the help of the *lex Sempronia*, had made it impossible for either of Caesar's provinces to become

consular till 48. In the first place, on the principle—*cessante legis ratione cessat ipsa lex*—it might be interpreted as abrogating the *lex Sempronia*, so that on March 1, 50 the senate could make Caesar's provinces, or one of them, consular not for 48 but for 49. In the second place, as the Sullan regulations, making Jan. 1 the necessary commencement of a provincial command, were also annulled, no obstacle could, as in 54, be put in the way of a successor replacing Caesar on March 1, so that on that date he could be made *privatus*. Caesar recognised how the ground was cut from beneath his feet when he complained, *in se iura magistratuum commutari ne ex praetura et consulatu ut semper sed per paucos electi et probati in provincias mittantur* (*b. c.* 1, 85). Only one constitutional chance still remained. If the *lex Sempronia* lapsed, so did the provision contained in it that tribunician *intercessio* was inapplicable against the settlement of consular provinces (*de prov. cons.* 7, 17). If by this means the senate could be prevented from completing the steps necessary for his recall till the summer of 49, it would be compelled to acquiesce in the carrying out of the tribunician law of 52, and by that acquiescence would perhaps be morally, if not legally, precluded from interfering with Caesar's *semenstre imperium* till the end of the year. Such was the constitutional position when the actual struggle began in 51.

It may be asserted with confidence that during the next two years the Catonian party, always probably a small minority in the senate, but which far more than Pompey was responsible for the new law, never swerved from their aim of making Caesar a *privatus* after March 1, 49, while Caesar on his side would refuse every compromise which would leave him a *privatus* for however short a space before entering on his second consulship. That the Catonian party determined to open the struggle in 51, and so to violate the sanction of the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*, can only be explained by two considerations. (1) If there was any chance that the *lex Sempronia* might still be appealed to in spite of Pompey's law, it would be too late to leave the matter till 50, and the *relatio ante tempus* must be risked. (2) The sanction might be, as other

sanctions sometimes were, ignored with impunity, if only senators generally and Pompey in particular lent their moral support.

The proposal of Marcellus, as I have already argued, must have been that the two Gauls should be fixed as consular provinces after March 1, 49 (*provincias Gallias finienti Kalendarum Martiarum die; ad Att.* 8, 3, 3). There is no doubt that it was Pompey's resistance which prevented this proposal from being carried, as the evidence of Cicero (*loc. cit.*), Dio Cassius (40, 59), and Appian (2, 26) agrees on this point. But it is not clear whether it was defeated or withdrawn. Hirtius (*b. g.* 8, 53) definitely says that the senate rejected it, but the evidence of Caelius is against this version. On May 24 he writes: *Marcellus adhuc nihil rettulit de successione provinciarum Galliarum et in Kal. Jun., ut mihi ipse dixit, eam distulit relationem* (*ad fam.* 9, 1, 2). In June he says: *Marcelli impetus resederunt non inertia sed, ut mihi videtur, consilio* (*ib.* 8, 2, 2). It therefore is probable that Pompey, who was not prepared to repudiate the sanction of his own law, staved off the motion till after the consular elections, thereby making it necessary, if anything was to be done, to ignore the *lex Sempronia.*

We gather from Caelius (8, 4, 4) that as late as August Pompey had not yet committed himself, and was anxious to avoid doing so, *de successione Caesaris hoc est de provinciis.* In the beginning of Sept. Caelius, though not expecting any decisive action till next year, reports Pompey as making it plain (almost certainly in connexion with the attack of Marcellus on the *absentis ratio*, alluded to in Suet. c. 26 and Liv. *epit.* 108) that he was opposed to Caesar's election to the consulship while retaining his command, though he thought it premature to pass any decree on the subject. *Pompeius tuus aperte Caesarem et provinciam tenere cum exercitu et consul; ipse tamen hanc sententiam dixit, nullum hoc tempore senatus consultum faciendum* (*ad fam.* 8, 9, 3).

But later in the same month Pompey allowed his views to be still more unmistakably known, so unmistakably that the senate, no doubt on the initiative of Marcellus, was emboldened to pass several important decrees.

Pompey's view at this time is thus expressed by Caelius:

plane perspecta Cn. Pompei voluntate in eam partem ut eum decedere post Kal. Mart. placeret (8, 8, 4). This is of course a crucial passage, and Hirschfeld's theory stands or falls with his interpretation of it.

If the words *post Kal. Mart.* refer to 50[1], then undoubtedly no second *quinquennium* was granted to Caesar, and both Dec. 29, 50, and March 1, 49, are as legal terminations of Caesar's command ruled out. But on the other hand, if we assume, as the evidence already considered entitles us to do, a five years' extension, all difficulties in the way of referring the Kalends of March to 49 will disappear. For on that assumption (*a*) we get an intelligible explanation of the motion of Marcellus in 51, and (*b*) are able to confirm the statements of Suetonius and Appian that Marcellus in 50 made precisely the same proposal. Marcellus proposed to terminate Caesar's command (*provincias Gallias finire*) by recalling him at the end of the *quinquennium* (*Kalendarum Martiarum die*) by making his provinces consular from that date. Thus Caesar would have had *decedere post Kal. Mart.* Pompey had resisted this only on the ground that Marcellus had acted *ante tempus* and it was not till the following Sept. that he allowed it to be known that he wished Caesar *decedere post Kal. Mart.* As this was immediately followed by the decree of Sept. 29 directing the consuls of 50 to make a proposal on March 1 *de provinciis consularibus* (*ad fam.* 8, 8, 5) it is certain that that proposal was intended to give effect to Pompey's known wishes, viz. *ut eum decedere post Kal. Mart. placeret.* It is again only on the assumption that Caesar could legally retain his position till March 49 that we can explain the attack of Marcellus on the *absentis ratio*, and Pompey's expression of opinion on it as quoted above. For, if, as Hirschfeld believes, it had been legally possible to get rid of Caesar in March 50, the question of the *absentis ratio*, demonstrably belonging to 49, could have had no critical importance in 51.

[1] I find it impossible to accept the suggestion of Dr Rice Holmes that *post Kal. Mart.* refers to 50, but is to be taken with *placeret* and not with *decedere*. This would leave the date of Caesar's recall, on which everything depended, vague and indeterminate.

But, it may be asked, why, if Caelius was referring to 49, does he not say so? Because, on the assumption that Caesar's command legally ended in March 49, it was not necessary. Neither to Caelius nor to Cicero, who were forecasting all this time what Caesar would do or would be obliged to do *cum legis dies transierit*, could there be any ambiguity. Their eyes were fixed on the year 49 and especially on March 1 of that year, and therefore such statements as "Caesar must go on March 1" or "Caesar may possibly not stand for the consulship 'this year'" or "Caesar may be allowed to stay till Nov. 13" would need no explanation. It would have been ridiculous for Caelius to have written *post Kal. Mart. secundas* or *Idibus Nov. secundis*, just as Cicero himself in *ad Att.* 8, 3, 3, leaves undated by its year the expression *Kalendarum Martiarum die.*

On the other hand, when the *senatus consultum* passed on Sept. 29, 51, provides that the consuls designate should hold a meeting *de provinciis consularibus ex Kal. Mart.*, it would be clear, even without the addition of the words *quae in suo magistratu futurae essent*, that the next year, 50, is intended. Similarly, when Pompey's speech in support of this *senatus consultum* and in explanation of his own position is quoted, declaring that after March 1 he will have no objection to a decision on the subject of Caesar's provinces, it is obvious that he is referring to the same March 1 as that specified in the decree under consideration. For it is immediately after transcribing the senatorial decrees that Caelius proceeds: *Ea praeterea Cn. Pompei sunt animadversa...ut diceret* (these words show what follows to be a quotation from Pompey's speech) *se ante Kal. Mart. non posse sine iniuria de provinciis Caesaris statuere; post Kal. Mart. se non dubitaturum.* It seems to me therefore that, if we examine a little more carefully than Hirschfeld has felt it worth while to do, the context of the three passages in this letter where the Kalends of March are mentioned, no contradiction or inconsistency is involved in referring the first to 49, the other two to 50. I will even go further and say that the contradiction is involved in Hirschfeld's own interpretation.

For him the statement of Pompey's views *ut eum decedere*

post Kal. Mart. placeret[1] and the quotation from his speech *post Kal. Mart. se non dubitaturum (de provinciis Caesaris statuere)* mean exactly the same thing. But *statuere de provinciis Caesaris* can only mean to give a decided vote on the motion to be brought forward on March 1, 50, and we happen to know from the terms of the *senatus consultum* transcribed by Caelius what that motion was. It was technically not a proposal *de provinciis Caesaris* but raised the wider question *de provinciis consularibus*. The Gallic provinces however could in March 50 be legally discussed with the rest, and it was no doubt understood that one or both of these would be selected. If they were, it would be a motion, as we know from Cicero that it was, *ut Caesari succederetur* (*ad Att.* 7, 7, 5). As the *lex Sempronia* was regarded as out of force, it was clearly not the consular provinces for 48 that were to be selected, but, as by all precedent and analogy provinces were fixed in the year before they were to be held, the proposal concerned the consular provinces for 49. It follows that Pompey's promised vote could not have been for Caesar's immediate recall on March 1, 50, that not being the question before the senate, but it would be indirectly a vote for his recall on March 1, 49 (*eum decedere post Kal. Mart.*), since it would make his provinces consular as early in 49 as they were legally vacant[2]. If Hirschfeld had borne in mind the technical meaning of *successio provinciarum*, he would have seen that his view of the proposal made by Marcellus in 50 is wholly untenable.

We have no more evidence as to Pompey's attitude till the spring of 50, when the motion of Marcellus *de provinciis consularibus* had been voted upon, but had been blocked and hung up by the *intercessio* of Curio. That *intercessio* created so complete a dead-lock in regard to what was undoubtedly

[1] As I have already pointed out, Judeich is discreetly silent about the two phrases *provincias Gallias Kalendarum Martiarum die finienti* and *eum decedere post Kal. Mart.* They are both obviously inconsistent with his hypothesis that Caesar's command legally ended on Dec. 29, 50.

[2] This is perfectly consistent with Appian (2, 26), who says that Pompey in 51 δῆλον ἐποίησεν ὅτι χρὴ μετὰ τὸν χρόνον παραλύειν τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτίκα τὸν Καίσαρα. That Appian did not place this term μετὰ τὸν χρόνον early in 50, I have already pointed out.

the absorbing question of the hour, that possible means of removing it must at once have engaged the attention of the senate. The situation had been foreseen, and tentatively provided for by the declaration registered in the previous Sept., that any tribune blocking the contemplated decrees should be regarded as acting *contra rem publicam.* Probably the Catonian party were for taking extreme action (*omnibus rebus premere Curionem*) at once, but it was a serious step to take, and others besides Caelius might regard it as provoking civil war.

The situation at the end of April may be gathered from a letter of Caelius (*ad fam.* 8, 11, 3). *In unam causam omnis contentio coniecta est, de provinciis; in quam adhuc incubuisse cum senatu Pompeius videtur ut Caesar Id. Nov. decedat; Curio omnia potius subire constituit quam id pati...Nostri porro, quos tu bene nosti, ad extremum certamen rem deducere non audebant. Scaena rei totius haec: Pompeius, tanquam Caesarem non inpugnet sed quod illi aequum putet constituat, ait Curionem quaerere discordias, valde autem non vult et plane timet Caesarem† cos. desig. prius quam exercitum et provinciam tradiderit. Accipitur satis male a Curione et totus eius secundus consulatus exagitatur. Hoc tibi dico: si omnibus rebus prement Curionem, Caesar defendet intercessorem; si, quod videntur, reformidarint, Caesar, quoad volet, manebit.* It is clear from this that, in the hope of finding a way out which Curio would not block, and which the Catonians might accept, the senate, not without Pompey's adhesion, had suggested a compromise, intended to dispense with the necessity for extreme action. Caesar was to be allowed, *cum legis dies transierit,* not only to retain his command long enough to make use of the *absentis ratio,* but for four months longer still, to Nov. 13. Why this date was chosen, is not clear, but it was no doubt calculated so as not to prevent the Catonian extremists from bringing their threatened impeachment before the end of the year.

It was of course on the face of it a considerable concession to Caesar, since it allowed him more than eight months' grace after the expiration of his legal term, and its rejection might seem to put Curio and Caesar in the wrong. Curio however

was quick to see the trap: he realised that to accept this specious compromise was to give up the one point vital to Caesar's safety, the avoidance of an interval, however short, during which, as a *privatus*, he would have to run the gauntlet of an impeachment at the hands of his enemies. To allow the *absentis ratio*, and with it election to the consulship in July, was to give with one hand what an impeachment between Nov. 13 and the end of the year would take away with the other. It would in fact render more than precarious the second consulship; *totus eius secundus consulatus exagitatur*. Curio therefore announced his intention of risking the extremist pressure rather than leave this insidious proposal unblocked. Pompey of course ignored the real point, affected to be scandalised at Curio's contentious behaviour, *ait Curionem quaerere discordias*, and protested that the arrangement was not unfair to Caesar, obviously soothing his conscience with the palliating reflection that after all Caesar would get everything agreed upon at Luca except six short weeks. But, while protesting against the fuss made by Curio about so "fair" a proposal, Pompey was really, Caelius seems to have thought, rather relieved, since he was strongly averse to and clearly afraid of the *absentis ratio*[1].

At any rate, Curio's threatened opposition clearly put an end to the scheme, and we hear no more of it. By Sept. we find that Pompey has reverted to the Catonian position as expressed in the proposal of Marcellus; *Cn. Pompeius constituit non pati C. Caesarem consulem aliter fieri nisi exercitum et provincias tradiderit* (8, 14. 2). As a matter of fact, Caelius in his last sentence seems to sweep aside all thoughts of this futile compromise, and to sum up the situation as Curio's *intercessio* in March had left it. "If they adopt the plan of putting the extreme pressure on Curio, it will mean civil war; if, as their previous conduct makes likely, they shrink from this, Caesar will remain till his second consulship and longer if he likes."

It remains to notice how Hirschfeld and Judeich deal with

[1] That this is the force of *autem*, which Hirschfeld's interpretation wholly ignores, I cannot doubt.

this passage. The former, arguing that the Ides of November can only be those of 50, finds in the passage his strongest proof that Caesar's command did not legally continue till March 1, 49, for Pompey could never have represented it as fair to recall Caesar three months and a half before the expiration of his legal term (*Klio*, IV, p. 72; V, pp. 238—9)[1].

His arguments for referring the Ides of Nov. to 50 may be summarised thus. (1) If Caelius had meant the year 49, he would have said so, i.e. he would have inserted *secundis*. (2) In that case Curio's extreme opposition is inexplicable, since it would have been a concession of all the time claimed by Caesar minus six weeks. (3) As compared with the proposal of Marcellus in March, this suggestion might well be represented by Pompey as *aequum*. (4) If Pompey allowed Caesar to remain till Nov. 49, he would concede the *absentis ratio*, but in that case, how could Caelius say that he was averse to and afraid of Caesar's election while still retaining his command?

I will reply to these points *seriatim*. (1) As I have argued in regard to *decedere post Kal. Mart.* and *hoc anno*, the whole attention of Caelius and Cicero was absorbed in the year 49, the critical year in which Caesar's command would end, in which the *absentis ratio* would be claimed, and in which civil war might become inevitable. In discussing these matters there was only one year for them, and to specify it was utterly unnecessary. (2) It is true that to allow Caesar to remain till Nov. 49 would have been a retreat from the Catonian position, and a concession of eight extra months, but, as already pointed out, to have accepted it would have jeopardised Caesar's whole position and might well have made the second consulship impossible. Nor is Hirschfeld correct in saying that Caesar

[1] Hirschfeld justifies his hypothesis that the *lex Pompeia-Licinia* contained no *legis dies* other than the preclusive one, March 1, 50, by asserting that only in this way can we reconcile on the one hand the proposal of Marcellus for Caesar's instant recall in March 50, followed by the suggestion of a respite till Nov., and on the other, Caesar's own claim to remain till the end of 49. Several questions however are begged in this claim to have simplified the problem. I hope I have shown that Marcellus made no such proposal, and if he did not, Hirschfeld's view as to the Ides of Nov. must be abandoned.

himself later in the year offered terms more unfavourable to himself. He no doubt alludes to the statement of Suetonius (*Iul.* 29) that Caesar offered to give up Transalpine Gaul on condition of retaining the Cisalpine with two legions, or even Illyricum with one *donec consul fieret*. The last words Hirschfeld interprets like Mommsen to mean "until elected consul," i.e. in July 49, but Caesar could have made no such offer, since it would have relinquished the *semenstre imperium* so essential to his personal safety. Even Caelius as late as Sept. realises more clearly than he had done in the previous Oct. Caesar's determination on this point: *Caesari persuasum est se salvum esse non posse, si ab exercitu recesserit* (8, 14, 2). The obvious meaning of the offer was that Caesar might avoid being *privatus* till the end of 49, and this object would have been effected by retaining a mere nominal command like Illyricum. If Caesar was ever to reach his second consulship, Curio had no alternative but *omnia subire quam id pati*. (3) As regards the assertion that the suggestion of Pompey and the senate was *aequum* as compared with the proposal of Marcellus, I have already dealt with Hirschfeld's inexcusable misunderstanding of this latter proposal. But it is no doubt true that, whether Marcellus was for recalling Caesar in March 50 or in March 49 an extension to Nov. in either year was in a sense *aequum*, because it was a concession. The real question however is, whether it was *aequum* in view of Pompey's agreement with Caesar at Luca. Hirschfeld himself admits that that agreement was for Caesar to be safe-guarded till the end of 49, and yet he argues that it might be called *aequum* to recall him fifteen months and a half before that time. I do not say that the suggestion, as affecting 49, was really *aequum*, but it at least allowed the specious, though hollow, plea that Caesar was after all losing only six weeks. (4) As to the inconsistency which Hirschfeld finds between Pompey's acceptance of the senatorial compromise conceding the *absentis ratio* and several months beyond it and his dislike and fear of Caesar's election while still retaining his army, the objection has been completely met by my interpretation of the passage. It was only in the vain hope of shaking off the iron grip of Curio's *inter-*

cessio that he had agreed to the suggested extension, and his dislike and fear of Caesar's election remained. The word *autem* marks a strong contrast between his professed protest against Curio and his real feeling. If Hirschfeld had consulted 'his friend Bardt,' he would perhaps have realised that his interpretation required *enim* and not *autem*[1].

Judeich's explanation of this proposal to recall Caesar on Nov. 13 need not detain us long. As, like Hirschfeld, he refers this date to the year 50, he has to explain how Pompey could possibly represent it as *aequum* to deprive Caesar of his command six weeks before its legal termination, as fixed, in Judeich's opinion, by the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*. He can only meet the difficulty by suggesting that Caelius is merely reporting vague rumours pointing to the vacillation of Pompey, who could not have openly supported such a plan, though he might allow it to be understood that in his own mind he was not averse to it.

The very fact that he tried to represent it as *aequum* is an indication, Judeich thinks, that his conscience was uneasy. This obviously does not meet the case even as regards Pompey, especially if Caelius is right in making him declare that Curio by his opposition was merely seeking a quarrel. But Judeich fails to see the real difficulty which stands in the way of his theory. Putting Pompey himself out of the question, we cannot reasonably doubt that the senate, not of course including the Catonian irreconcilables, seriously meditated Caesar's recall on Nov. 13, and, as it is inconceivable that any responsible section in the senate would have put itself so hopelessly in the wrong as to curtail, even by six weeks, a legally fixed period, the Ides of November cannot have been those of 50, and must have been those of 49.

It seems to me that Dr Rice Holmes is far too lenient in considering Judeich's explanation of this passage. He contents himself with pointing out that, even if this view of the proposal and of Pompey's part in it is accepted, it is as consistent with

[1] If Hirschfeld believed that Pompey was still expecting the *absentis ratio* to be claimed in 50, his argument, as I have already shown, recoils upon himself.

taking March 1, 49 as the legal term as it is with Judeich's own date, Dec. 29, 50. The real point is that it is absolutely inconsistent with either date.

In the beginning of June, while Pompey was still indisposed at Naples, the Catonian party, led by M. Marcellus, attempted in accordance with the September decree to bring Curio to reason. Caelius describes what took place in 8, 13. *Voles, Cicero, Curionem nostrum lautum intercessionis de provinciis exitum habuisse; nam cum de intercessione referretur, quae relatio fiebat ex senatus consulto, primaque M. Marcelli sententia pronuntiata esset, qui agendum cum tribunis pl. censebat, frequens senatus in alia omnia iit. Stomacho est scilicet Pompeius Magnus ita languenti ut vix id quod sibi placeat reperiat. Transierant illuc rationem eius habendam qui neque exercitum neque provincias traderet. Quem ad modum Pompeius hoc laturus sit, cum cognoscam, quidnam rei publicae futurum sit, si† aut non curet, vos, senes divites, videritis.* Cicero believed that Curio would have given way if the senate had supported Marcellus; *nunquam enim Curio sustinuisset, si cum eo agi coeptum esset, quam sententiam senatus sequi noluit; ex quo factum est ut Caesari non succederetur* (*ad Att.* 7, 7, 5). At any rate, the senate shrank from the only means of making their decree of March effective, and Caelius describes it as a virtual change of front (*transierant illuc* etc.), involving the unconditional surrender of the *absentis ratio*, so that, as Caelius put it, *Caesar, quoad volet, manebit.* Pompey was known to dislike the *absentis ratio*, though for a moment he had been ready to concede it, but what attitude he would take up in the face of this humiliating surrender, Caelius does not know. As a matter of fact, the attention of both senate and Pompey was distracted from the main issue by a new and adroit suggestion of Curio.

V. Caesar's legal position after 52.

Caesar's legal and constitutional position after the passing of Pompey's *lex de iure magistratuum* was by no means hopeless, and his claim to retain his command after its legal termination did not, as Hirschfeld maintains (*Klio* IV, p. 85), depend wholly

or mainly on the tribunician law allowing the *absentis ratio* in 49. That law had been intended from the first to answer an important object, but Caesar could only take advantage of it, if he could by some other means maintain his position in his provinces till the elections of 49 came on. In the first place, the new law left unchanged the term of Caesar's command, as fixed by the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*, so that he was secure at any rate till March 1, 49. But it cancelled the Sullan arrangements, so that, if the Gauls could be made consular provinces for 49, Caesar could now be superseded at once on that day, and would have no claim of any kind to remain longer. In the second place, by practically abrogating the *lex Sempronia* it made it possible for the senate on or after March 1, 50 to fix Caesar's provinces as consular for 49.

On what then could Caesar rely? On this at any rate, that the question *de successione Caesaris* could only come on as a proposal *de provinciis consularibus* (conf. the phrase of Caelius; *de successione Caesaris...hoc est de provinciis*, 8, 4, 4), and this again (*a*) would by all precedent have to be made in the year previous to the vacancy, (*b*) would, before being effective, have to be followed by the nomination of ex-consuls of proper standing, and (*c*) would only affect him, if one or both of his provinces were selected.

After the failure of Marcellus in 51 *de provinciis Caesaris ante tempus referre*, the first struggle was on the third point. If all the provinces, consular and praetorian, for 49[1], were settled at the same time, there would be at least the chance that other provinces might be fixed as consular, and the two Gauls left alone. If, on the other hand, the praetorian provinces were settled first, things might be so arranged as to make all provinces praetorian except those which the senate wished to be consular. It is this consideration which explains the forecast of Caelius written in 51 before the *senatus consulta* of

[1] I have already pointed out that practically the provinces to be settled, both consular and praetorian, were for 49. Cilicia e.g. which was to be praetorian, and Syria which was eventually consular, would not be vacant till July 50, and as a matter of fact, it is certain that no decisions were effectively made about any provinces between Sept. 51 and Jan. 49.

Sept. (8, 5, 2) *Nosti haec tralaticia; de Gallis constituetur; erit qui intercedat; deinde alius exsistet qui, nisi libere liceat de omnibus provinciis decernere senatui, reliquas impediat.* Similarly in 8, 9, 2 he writes: *Quantum divino, relinquendus tibi erit qui provinciam obtineat* (i.e. Cilicia will not be made a praetorian province in time for you to leave it at the end of your year), *nam non expeditur successio, quoniam Galliae, quae habent intercessorem, in eandem conditionem quam ceterae provinciae vocantur.* On Sept. 29 the Caesarian tribune, Pansa, blocked a proposal to settle the praetorian provinces on the line indicated above (8, 8, 8), but on the other hand it was resolved to decide on the consular provinces without the praetorian (*nere quid coniunctim*) on March 1, 50. On that date, as we have already seen, the motion *de provinciis consularibus* must have been put by C. Marcellus, and one or both of Caesar's provinces must have been fixed as consular for 49[1], i.e. after March 1 of that year. The senate was within its constitutional rights in taking this step, and it rendered inoperative the tribunician law conceding the *absentis ratio*, since from March to July Caesar would be *privatus*, and could at best only claim the exemption as a virtual exile. But the motion of Marcellus presupposed the abrogation of the *lex Sempronia*, and with that law disappeared the prohibition against tribunician interference with the settlement of consular provinces (*de prov. cons.* 7, 17)[2].

There was therefore no legal obstacle in the way of Curio's *intercessio*, which, as we have seen, blocked and made ineffective the decree, and which on grounds of equity Caesar could justify as the only means of meeting Pompey's gross breach of faith in passing his *lex de iure magistratuum*.

What Caesar wanted, and had wanted ever since Luca, was

[1] This decree was not vetoed, partly because it was in accordance with the *lex Pompeia-Licinia*, and partly because no *intercessio* was necessary till the Gauls were actually made consular, and as the praetorian province, as the result of Pansa's *intercessio*, would still be open, this might possibly be still staved off.

[2] In 56 Cicero met the idea of recalling Gabinius and Piso by making their provinces praetorian with the objection *tum enim tribunus intercedere poterit.* He goes on: *sed mihi credite; nunquam illis succedetur nisi cum ea lege referetur qua intercedi de provinciis non licebit*, i.e. by making their provinces consular in accordance with the *lex Sempronia.*

to retain his command till entering on the consulship without civil war, and without open disobedience to an effective decree of the senate. As long as Pompey had been loyal, there had been no difficulty; now everything depended on whether Curio's *intercessio* could be maintained through 50, and whether the *intercessio* of other tribunes could be secured through 49. If so, the prediction of Caelius in 51 might be verified: *Sic multum ac diu ludetur atque ita diu ut plus biennium in his tricis moretur* (8, 5, 2).

But the senate had at its disposal a possible counter-stroke which might or might not be justified by precedent. Its decree had been perfectly legitimate, and Curio's obstruction, however justifiable on grounds of equity (which after all concerned a personal understanding between Caesar and Pompey), might be regarded as politically inexcusable and seditious. If no lesser pressure availed, he might be declared, according to the decree of Sept. 29, to have acted *contra rempublicam*, and might even find himself the object of the last decree. In this case he would probably leave Rome, his *intercessio* thereby lapsing, and the blocked decree would automatically become effective. This was certainly the course urged by M. Marcellus, and its rejection was the cause *ut Caesari non succederetur* (*ad Att.* 7, 7, 6). It was rejected because it would have meant civil war, since others besides Caelius could realise that *si omnibus rebus prement Curionem, Caesar defendet intercessorem.*

I am convinced that Hirschfeld is led into a wrong track by Appian, when he declares that the senatorial decree passed by Marcellus in March was met by Curio with the audacious proposal that Caesar and Pompey should resign together. It was rather an adroit manoeuvre on the part of Curio and Caesar[1] intended partly to delay action against his own *intercessio*, partly to embroil Pompey with the senate, and especially to embarrass both. It introduced a side issue quite irrelevant to the main question, which it only affected indirectly by hastening on the crisis at the end of the year[2].

[1] Caesar claims the suggestion in *b. c.* 1, 43: *patientiam proponit suam cum de exercitibus dimittendis ultro postulavisset*, and Hirtius confirms this (*b. g.* 8, 52).

[2] Judeich tries to read into Curio's

At what point it was first suggested, whether by Caesar or by Curio, is not clear[1], but it is first alluded to by Caelius in September, when after stating Caesar's determination not to resign his army, he adds: *fert tamen illam conditionem ut ambo exercitus tradant* (8, 14, 2). It had probably been hanging over Pompey and the senate for some time, and may have been an answer to the proposal about November 13, which looks like a less skilful attempt to put Caesar in the wrong.

Early in December a large majority of the senate passed a decree that Pompey and Caesar should resign together. By this it was no doubt intended that Caesar should become *privatus* on March 1, while Pompey, to whom a second *quinquennium* had been granted in 52 (App. 2, 26 and Dio Cass. 40, 56), was asked to abandon the last four years of his command. But (1) it was futile to order Caesar to resign while the decree making his provinces consular was still blocked, and (2) the senate had no right to curtail Pompey's legal term. It was apparently the disgust of the Catonian minority which led to the irregular action of Marcellus, the consul designate, in authorising Pompey to raise troops and to Pompey's acceptance of the commission. It was this which changed the whole situation, for Caesar, who had so far hoped to stave off effective senatorial action through 49 by means of tribunician obstruction, now realised that the initiative of war might come from his opponents, and that his

proposal a revival of the principle 'equal rights for all,' which he thinks Caesar had conceded at Luca. It was however in effect to call on Pompey to give up four years of his second *quinquennium*. Pompey had in appearance a great advantage over Caesar in still having four years of his command to run, but Caesar well knew that, if only he could reach the second consulship, the future would be in his hands.

[1] Appian (2, 24) says that Curio supported the proposal of Marcellus, but added as a rider that Pompey should resign too. This leaves no room for the *intercessio* testified to by Caelius, and Hirtius (*b. g.* 8, 52) clearly puts the "promise" made by Curio that both should resign in the latter half of the year after the consular elections. As to the passing of the resolution in the senate, Appian appears to place it shortly before the termination of Curio's office, and represents it as Curio's proposal after the consuls had tried to put the cases of Pompey and Caesar separately. On the other hand, Hirtius (c. 52 *ad fin.*) says that Curio was about to carry out his promise *per discessionem*, but that the consuls intervened and themselves brought the affair to a division.

plan of reaching his object by constitutional means might at any moment become unworkable.

It was becoming more and more clear that Caesar's opponents intended to prevent his second consulship. Cicero himself gives expression to the views of the senate when he writes, *nihil timendum magis quam ille consul*; while he attributes the same apprehension to Pompey: *eo consule certum est Pompeio esse in Hispania* (*ad Att.* 7, 9, 3). It is for this reason that in his letters to Atticus written in December, Cicero seems to represent the whole question as turning on the *absentis ratio*. He assumes that by the continued effect of tribunician obstruction Caesar will retain his command *cum legis dies transierit*, will thus be able to take advantage of the tribunician law, and in fact, as Caelius had put it, *quoad volet manebit*[1].

Caesar's own eyes were equally fixed on the consulship, and with a view to it, on the *absentis ratio*. Cicero, in making him say *depugnes oportet nisi concedas* does not misrepresent his attitude. To make sure of the consulship, he was ready to make considerable sacrifices, though not to incur the risk of impeachment by running the gauntlet of however short an interval as *privatus*. *Caesari persuasum est se salvum esse non posse si ab exercitu recesserit*. But he made an offer towards the close of the year the acceptance of which would have secured his position. He professed himself willing to resign Transalpine Gaul with eight legions at the end of his legal term, if it was understood that he might retain Cisalpine Gaul with two legions, or even Illyricum with one legion *donec consul fieret* (Suet. *Jul.* 29; App. 2, 32)[2]. By this arrangement Caesar would at least have secured the *absentis ratio*, and would

[1] Cicero's apostrophe to Caesar in 7, 9 assumes that the senatorial decree will have been blocked from March 50 to March 49 and that the obstruction will be continued at least up to the elections. The words *ut tibi succedatur decernitur; impedis* describe the situation ever since the motion of Marcellus. I cannot agree with Dr Rice Holmes that *decernitur* is equivalent to *decretum est*.

[2] The phrase *consul fieri* is ambiguous, and may equally well mean "to be elected" or "to become" consul. It must be interpreted by the context or by the situation. To interpret it in this passage as Mommsen and Hirschfeld do is to make Caesar stultify his whole position.

escape the necessity of becoming *privatus*. It was apparently the refusal of this offer, accentuated by the threatening attitude of the Catonian minority, which induced Caesar to send Curio with an ultimatum at the end of the year.

His demands, *minaces et acerbae* from the circumstances under which they were sent (*ad fam.* 16, 11, 2), were probably a repetition of his claim to retain at least one of his provinces till the end of 49, and they confronted the senate with Cicero's alternative, *aut habenda e lege ratio aut depugnandum est*[1]. The answer of the senate, once more under the influence of the Catonian section, was a counter ultimatum: *uti ante certam diem Caesar exercitum dimitteret; si non faciat, eum adversus rem publicam facturum videri* (*b. c.* 1, 1)[2]. This of course was merely preliminary to the constitutional steps still necessary to supersede Caesar on March 1. It however answered its purpose, for the Caesarian tribunes interposed their veto, and the senate at last adopted the extreme course which M. Marcellus had urged against Curio. With the passing of the *senatus consultum ultimum* and the consequent flight of the tribunes from Rome Caesar's last constitutional support had broken down, and there was no longer any obstacle to his supersession in due form on March 1.

The settlement and assignment of all provinces had been blocked since the previous March, and it was impossible now to allow the usual intervals between the several steps. But except in this one point the normal course was taken. The status of all the provinces was discussed and settled; Transalpine Gaul and Syria were made consular, the latter immediately, the former from March 1, while Cisalpine Gaul, Cilicia and the other eight provinces were made praetorian. At the same time, or immediately afterwards, governors were appointed, Scipio to Syria,

[1] Hirtius (8, 54 *ad fin.*) correctly describes Caesar's attitude up to this time; *Caesar omnia patienda esse statuit quoad spes sibi aliqua relinqueretur iure potius disceptandi quam belli gerendi.*

[2] I disagree with Dr Rice Holmes' view that *ante certam diem* refers to July 1. After Caesar's ultimatum there could be no more compromise, and it was clearly now the Catonian stand-point which was being taken up, *viz.* that Caesar should not have a day beyond his legal term.

Dom. Ahenobarbus to Transalpine Gaul, Nonianus to the Cisalpine. *Provinciae privatis decernuntur, duae consulares, reliquae praetoriae; Scipioni obvenit Syria, L. Domitio Gallia* (*b. c.* 1, 6; conf. also *ad fam.* 16, 12, 3). The result of these decrees and appointments, apart from the civil war which they inevitably foreshadowed, was, by making Caesar *privatus* after March 1, to nullify the grant of the *absentis ratio*, which had all along presupposed that he would be in possession of his provinces at the date of the elections. This was fully recognised by Caesar himself who, in his final offer (made of course because he knew that it would be refused) was ready, if the Italian levies were disbanded and Pompey went to Spain, to become *privatus* and to canvass in person. *Feruntur omnino conditiones ab illo, ut Pompeius eat in Hispaniam, dilectus qui sunt habiti... dimittantur; se ulteriorem Galliam Domitio, citeriorem Considio Noniano...traditurum* (i.e. on March 1); *ad consulatus petitionem se venturum, neque iam se velle absente se rationem haberi suam; se praesentem trinum nundinum petiturum* (*ad fam.* 16, 12, 3). Perfectly consistent too with the view taken above is the passage in *b. c.* 1, 9: *doluisse se quod beneficium populi Romani per contumeliam ab inimicis extorqueretur, ereptoque semenstri imperio in urbem retraheretur, cuius absentis rationem haberi populus iussisset.* Caesar's complaint is that the action of his enemies, i.e. the law of Pompey and the decrees of January made possible by it, had made the *beneficium populi*, the grant of the *absentis ratio*, of no use to him; for, though it had been intended to secure him the last six months of the year[1], he was being brought back to Rome superseded and *privatus*. The

[1] As Hirschfeld has withdrawn his ill-considered contention that *semenstre imperium* means the first six months of 49 instead of the last six, I need not point out the contradictions involved in that view. If Caesar was to be consul in 48, the retention of his provincial command from July to December depended absolutely on the *absentis ratio*, since by coming home to canvass he would have laid down his *imperium*. But before Pompey's law it was certain that he could use the *beneficium*, after that law he could only use it if his supersession by the senate could be obstructed till July. (For Hirschfeld's argument and its withdrawal see *Klio*, IV, pp. 85—6 n. 6, and V, p. 237 n. 4.)

whole point is that the tribunician law, the validity of which was not disputed, had presupposed a condition, viz. Caesar's absence in Gaul during July, which his supersession on March 1 had cancelled. Caesar had exhausted all the constitutional means at his disposal, and the only alternative to his political annihilation was civil war.

E. G. HARDY.

TRANSPOSITIONS IN THE IBIS OF OVID.

In my recension of the Ibis, published in 1894 as part of Postgate's corpus poetarum Latinorum, tom. I fasc. 2, I transposed four distichs, 135–140[1] and 459 sq., and suggested the transposition of three more, 181 sq., 203 sq., 409 sq. Perhaps, after two-and-twenty years, it is time to unravel the mystery of this behaviour, and disclose my inscrutable reasons for resorting to the most unpopular of all methods of emendation.

One of the causes why any proposal to correct a verse or sentence alarms and distresses the natural man is that it makes an unusual demand upon his intellect and entails the weary work of reading and considering the context. That form of correction which consists in transferring a verse or sentence from one place to another is in consequence doubly discomposing, because the mental fatigue which it involves is twice as heavy. There are two contexts to be read and considered, not only one.

Disrelish for excessive and unwonted labour will often put on disguises, and much is sometimes said on these occasions about the respect due to the authority of MSS. But that is a cloak which does not always fit; and whatever may be the reason why Ovid's editors, in the passage which I shall first examine, maintain the arrangement of verses which I propose to disturb, it cannot be their respect for MS authority. MS authority is here divided, and the weight of it is adverse.

For more than 400 years the editors of the Ibis, with the single exception of myself, have printed the two verses 338 'ultores rapiant turpe cadauer equi' and 339 'uiscera sic aliquis scopulus tua figat ut olim' in juxtaposition; and so they mean to print them still. Their authority? one, only one, and that

[1] I follow the numeration of Ellis and of Merkel's last edition: in other texts the numbering is sometimes two verses out.

not the best nor the next best, of the seven[1] MSS possessing independent value. Only in X, Parisinus 7994 saec. XIII, does 339 immediately follow 338: in two MSS there is one distich between them, in one MS there are two distichs, and in three there are three. So much do the editors here respect MS authority: what they really respect is editorial tradition. The true reason why 338 and 339 are still printed together is that Iacobus Rubeus printed them so in his text of 1474, which became by chance a parent of the vulgate.

I will set out the verses with their surrounding context, and add in the margin a guaranty of the MSS.[2]

331 utque uel Eurydamas ter circum busta Thrasylli
est Larisaeis raptus ab hoste rotis,
uel qui quae fuerat tutatus moenia saepe
corpore lustrauit non diuturna suo,

[1] The seven are TGXPVFH, and this order is roughly their order of merit.

[2] Statements touching the two MSS G and T I make on my own responsibility: of F and V we get our reports from Merkel and Ellis, of H and P and X from Ellis alone, so we must expect contradictions and inaccuracy. The page of V now reproduced by photography in Chatelain's Paléographie des class. lat., part II pl. CI 2, displays their negligence, or that of their informants, in a disgraceful light; and neither is better or worse than the other.

That V presents the verses 637 sq. 439 sq. 461 sq. between 338 and 339 is the statement of Ellis, who said on p. lv of his edition 'usus sum apographo quod rogatu meo exscribendum curauit Iosephus Hauptius,' though to me he gave two different accounts, consistent neither with this nor with one another: (1) that the transcript was Haupt's own, (2) that it was a 'collation with Merkel's edition' (and therefore not a transcript). Merkel, who used a collation made by Moriz Haupt, reports on the contrary that V does not contain these six verses at all, either in that place or in the places indicated by their numeration. When I brought this discrepancy to Ellis's notice in 1891, he asseverated that he had accurately reproduced the testimony of Josef Haupt; and it is to be noted, as some confirmation, that in 439 he cites a variant from V, *utue* for *utque*, so that this verse at least would seem to be present in the MS.

That F presents the verses 439 sq. 461 sq. both before 339 and in the places indicated by their numeration is the statement of Ellis, who had seen the MS. Merkel on the contrary reports from the collation of Heinsius that F does not present these four verses in either position. This discrepancy also I brought to Ellis's notice, and he again assured me that his report was true; and it is in some measure confirmed by his citation from F of the readings *Cassandreus* and *dominus* in 461.

335 utque nouum passa genus Hippomeneide poenae
tractus in Actaea fertur adulter humo,
sic, ubi uita tuos inuisa reliquerit artus,
FGHPTVX 338 ultores rapiant turpe cadauer equi.
FGHP V 637 denique Sarmaticas inter Geticasque sagittas
638 his precor ut uiuas et moriare locis.
F H TV 439 utque ferox Phalaris lingua prius ense resecta
440 more bouis Paphio clausus in aere gemas.
461 aut, ut Cassandreus domino non mitior illo,
462 saucius ingesta contumuleris humo.
FGHPTVX 339 uiscera sic aliquis scopulus tua figat, ut olim
fixa sub Euboico Graia fuere sinu.

Now to investigate the true seat of the six verses thus interposed.

About the distich 637 sq. there can be no question: its only possible place in the poem is after 636; and there it is found in GTX. Since G presents it in both places, the conflict is between TX on the one hand and FHPV on the other: TX are in general the more trustworthy, and in this instance they do not belie their character.

Next comes the distich 439 sq.; and we will seek it in its usual context.

435 et tua sic latos spargantur membra per agros,
tamquam quae patrias detinuere uias.
aere Perilleo ueros imitere iuuencos
FGHPTVX 438 ad formam tauri conueniente sono.
FG P X 439 utque ferox Phalaris lingua prius ense resecta
440 more bouis Paphio clausus in aere gemas.
FGHPTVX 441 dumque redire uoles aeui melioris in annos
ut uetus Admeti decipiare socer.

Since F presents the two verses in both places, the conflict is between GPX and HTV. T is the best MS, GXP are the three next best, so that authority is nearly balanced and the cause must be tried on its merits. And every shallow and careless and hasty judge will instantly cry out that here the couplet is at home, because it has the same theme as 437 sq., the brazen bull of Agrigentum.

That is a reason why shallow and careless and hasty scribes should put 439 sq. in this place, even if its proper place was elsewhere: I have given examples of rearrangement so caused in the Classical Quarterly VIII p. 155. But I aver that 437 sq. and 439 sq. could not have been placed in juxtaposition either by Ovid or by any respectable practitioner of the art of verse. Both couplets are quite well written, and anyone capable of writing them would have taken great care to keep them apart, because of their phraseology. If he had written them to stand side by side, he would have written them otherwise, avoiding repetition and conferring point; not allowing *aere Perilleo* to be followed by *Paphio...in aere* nor *imitere iuuencos...sono* by *more bouis... gemas*. How Ovid manages such things may be seen in 365-8 (Oenomaus' victims and Oenomaus) 'ut iuuenes pereas quorum fastigia uultus | membraque Pisaeae sustinuere foris, | ut qui perfusam miserorum saepe procorum | ipse suo melius sanguine tinxit humum,' 397-400 (Thrasius and Busiris) 'ut qui post longum, saeri monstrator iniqui, | elicuit pluuias uictima caesus aquas, | frater ut Antaei, quo sanguine debuit, aras | tinxit et exemplis occidit ipse suis.' Placed where T places it, between 337 sq. and 461 sq., the couplet 439 sq. is without offence. There is no reason why Phalaris and his victims should occupy consecutive distichs: the Minotaur's victims are cited in 373 sq., the Minotaur himself in 408. And there is no reason why persons burnt in the brazen bull under different circumstances should all be mentioned together: persons torn to pieces by dogs are mentioned separately in 477 sq. and 595 sq.

So now let us proceed to the couplet 461 sq. in its usual context of 457–464.

457 inque pecus subito magnae uertare parentis,
uictor ut est celeri uictaque uersa pede.
solaque Limone poenam ne senserit illam
FGHPTVX 460 et tua dente fero uiscera carpat equs.
FG P X { 461 aut, ut Cassandreus domino non mitior illo,
462 saucius ingesta contumuleris humo.
FGHPTVX 463 aut ut Abantiades aut ut Cyeneius heros
clausus in aequoreas praecipiteris aquas.

The MSS are divided just as before, GPX on one side, HTV on the other.

Who is meant by *domino*[1]*...illo* in 461? The punctuation of most editors is ambiguous, but Merkel in his last recension clearly refers *non mitior* to Ibis himself and *domino illo* to *Cassandreus*. Such a comparison has no parallel in all this long series of examples, and so far Saluagnius is better advised in referring *mitior* to *Cassandreus* and *illo* to Hippomenes, implied in the mention of his daughter Limone at 459: the four words will then be meant as a clue to the identity of 'the Cassandrean.' But Hippomenes was no tyrant, *dominus*. He was one of the house of Codrus, king of Athens say some, archon say others, *εἷς τῶν πολιτῶν* says Aeschines Timarch. 182, who visited a domestic offence with a punishment which public opinion justly condemned as inhuman, but which Aeschines lauds as an example of antique severity, and which, if we may trust Heraclides Ponticus, was meant to repel the charge of softness and luxury which his family had incurred. And 'non mitior Hippomene' is an incredible way to describe that monster of tyranny Apollodorus of Cassandrea: Polyaen. strat. VI 7 *Ἀπολλόδωρος ὁ Κασσανδρεὺς...τύραννος ἐγένετο φονικώτατος καὶ ὠμότατος πάντων ὅσοι παρ' Ἕλλησιν ἢ παρὰ βαρβάροις ἐτυράννησαν*. The person whom the ancients couple with Apollodorus is Phalaris: Polyb. VII 7 2 *μήτε Φάλαριν μήτ' Ἀπολλόδωρον*, Plut. cum princ. phil. 3 5 *Ἀπολλοδώρου τοῦ τυράννου καὶ Φαλάριδος*, Dio Chrys. II 76 *Φάλαρίν τε καὶ Ἀπολλόδωρον*, Cic. n. d. III 82 'at Phalaris, at Apollodorus poenas sustulit,' Sen. dial. IV 5 1 'qualis fuit Apollodorus aut Phalaris,' de ben. VII 19 5 'qualis Apollodorus aut Phalaris.' Ovid himself brings the two together at ex Pont. II 9 43 sq. 'non tibi *Cassandreus* pater est gentisue Pheraeae | *quiue repertorem torruit arte sua*,' and in the Ibis, according to HTV, he brought them together again; for these MSS make 461 sq. follow 439 sq., so that *domino...illo* signifies Phalaris.

The best position then for 439 sq. and 461 sq. is that in which they are placed by the best MS. Standing together

[1] *dominus* FPX, but no editor now prefers this reading, and it would not mend matters.

between 338 and 339 they are in accord with one another and are not in disaccord with their context.

But the place immediately after 338, now occupied in FGHPV by 637 sq., is the best place in the poem for another distich, which in FGPX is immediately followed by 461 sq. The verses 459 sq.,

> solaque Limone poenam ne senserit illam
> et tua dente fero uiscera carpat equs,

are indeed explicable where they stand in the MSS, immediately after 458. But, since neither 458 nor the verses preceding it contain anything to which *poenam...illam* can refer, it is necessary to interpret these words as looking forward to the pentameter: and this, though possible, is not natural, and is contrary to the analogy of *domino...illo* in 461. If 459 sq. as well as 461 sq. are placed in the gap between 338 and 339, *poenam...illam* will refer to the *nouum...genus...poenae* of 335; and nothing could be more apt and harmonious. Ovid first imprecates on Ibis the doom of Limone's paramour, and then the doom of Limone herself. To mention a person first by patronymic (*Hippomeneide*) or some other periphrasis, and then directly afterwards by his or her proper name (*Limone*), is an artifice in which Latin poets take no less delight than Gibbon himself: Hor. carm. IV 8 22–4 'quid foret *Iliae* | *Mauortisque puer*, si taciturnitas | obstaret meritis aemula *Romuli*?', Ouid. trist. I 9 27 sq. 'de *comite* Argolici postquam cognouit *Orestae*, | narratur *Pyladen* ipse probasse Thoas,' Ib. 393–5 'ut iacet Aonio *luctator* ab hospite fusus | qui, mirum, uictor, cum cecidisset, erat, | ut quos *Antaei* fortes pressere lacerti.' The whole passage then will originally have stood as follows:

> 335 utque nouum passa genus Hippomeneide poenae
> tractus in Actaea fertur adulter humo,
> sic, ubi uita tuos inuisa reliquerit artus,
> 338 ultores rapiant turpe cadauer equi.
> 459 solaque Limone poenam ne senserit illam
> 460 et tua dente fero uiscera carpat equs.
> 439 utque ferox Phalaris lingua prius ense resecta
> 440 more bouis Paphio clausus in aere gemas.

461 aut, ut Cassandreus domino non mitior illo,
462 saucius ingesta contumuleris humo.
339 uiscera sic aliquis scopulus tua figat, ut olim
fixa sub Euboico Graia fuere sinu.

All the omissions and transpositions may be explained by the following history. The scribe has written the last word of 336, *humo*, and should now proceed to 337. But his eye descends to the *humo* which is the last word of 462, and he proceeds instead to 339, omitting 337 sq., 459 sq., 439 sq., and 461 sq. These omissions he discovers at a later stage. There is not room in the margin to insert the eight missing verses at the proper place, but there is room for two; so he there inserts the first two, 337 sq., which are closely and evidently connected with 335 sq.; the other six, 459 sq., 439 sq., 461 sq., he subjoins at the end of the whole series of imprecations, after 638, and adds marks to show whither they should be transferred. But these marks are in part obliterated or misunderstood. The couplet 459 sq. (Limone daughter of Hippomenes) is referred, by a reader who knows too much and yet too little, to 457 sq. (Hippomenes husband of Atalanta). In some copies it carries 461 sq. with it, while the couplet 439 sq. is attached to 437 sq. because the bull of Phalaris is in both. In other copies the marks of transposition are so far understood that 439 sq. and 461 sq. are restored to their right place before 339, or so far misinterpreted that 637 sq. are removed thither likewise or instead.

I daresay that those who accept as true the order of verses found in X may be able to frame an hypothesis explaining how the arrangement in T, which they think false, was brought about; but they will then be confronted with the further difficulty of explaining how it is that the false arrangement is so much more appropriate than the true. At present however they do not think it their business to explain anything, nor even to acquaint their readers or themselves with the facts of the case: their authority is the printed vulgate, and if MSS order the verses otherwise, that is transposition. Hear Mr Ehwald talk in Burs. Jahresb. vol. 109 p. 286: 'Am wenigsten kann ich

mich mit dem von Housman vorgeschlagenen Versumstellungen befreunden': he mentions some of these, and then proceeds 'noch unglaublicher ist die Anordnung, nach der nach v. 338 gelesen werden soll 459. 460. 439. 440. 461. 462.' No argument is vouchsafed, for none is needed: it matters not that this position of 439, 440, 461, 462 is their position in the best MS; the numeration of current editions is Mr Ehwald's norm, and anything which disturbs it is 'Umstellung.' Mr Owen goes even further: he has taken upon himself, in the interests of the commonwealth, to withhold from his readers what he regards as pernicious knowledge, and has contrived his apparatus criticus, not to instruct, but to edify. He prints 339 immediately after 338, and lets his readers suppose that he is obeying the MSS, when in truth he is obeying one MS and disobeying six. He places 439 sq. between 438 and 441, and lets his readers suppose that the MSS do so, when in truth half the MSS place them elsewhere. He places 637 sq. between 636 and 639, and never tells his readers that most of the MSS do not. Only at 461 sq. does he fail to shield our innocence from contact with the truth. There he confesses '459–460 (461–462) hic om. BHTV': but even this tiny dose of fact is diluted with fiction, for he adds 'in quibus post 336 (338) ponuntur.' Not one of these four MSS places the distich after 338: they all place it after 440.

The verses which I shall next consider are 135–140. These are placed by the seven MSS, without variation, immediately before 141; and not only by the MSS but by the independent defloratione Atrebatensis 65 and Parisina 17903 (saec. XIII).

certe ego, quae uoueo, superos motura putabo
speque tuae mortis, perfide, semper alar.
et prius hanc animam nimium tibi, saeue, petitam
auferet illa dies quae mihi sera uenit,
quam dolor hic umquam spatio euanescere possit,
leniat aut odium tempus et hora meum.
pugnabunt arcu dum Thraces, Iazyges hasta,
dum tepidus Ganges, frigidus Hister erit,
robora dum montes, dum mollia pabula campi,
dum Tiberis liquidas Tuscus habebit aquas,

tecum bella geram; nec mors mihi finiet iras,
saeua sed in manis manibus arma dabit.

dabit in 140 is Heinsius' correction of *dabo*; but if *dabo* is retained, though the phrase will be foolish, 'dabo arma (meis) manibus,' the main sense of the verse will not be affected; and that sense is unmistakable. Ovid declares that his warfare with Ibis will persist even when both of them are dead. The situation contemplated is that Ibis and Ovid are a pair of ghosts in the world below and are there continuing their ancient combat. Bear this in mind, and read on.

tum quoque, cum fuero uacuas dilapsus in auras,
exanguis mores[1] oderit umbra tuos.
tum quoque factorum ueniam memor umbra tuorum,
insequar et uultus ossea forma tuos.
siue ego, quod nolim, longis consumptus ab annis,
siue manu facta morte solutus ero,
siue per inmensas iactabor naufragus undas
nostraque longinqus uiscera piscis edet,
siue peregrinae carpent mea membra uolucres,
siue meo tinguent sanguine rostra lupi,
siue aliquis dignatus erit supponere terrae
et dare plebeio corpus inane rogo,
quidquid ero, Stygiis erumpere nitar ab oris
et tendam gelidas ultor in ora manus.
me uigilans cernes, tacitis ego noctis in umbris
excutiam somnos uisus adesse tuos.
denique quidquid ages, ante os oculosque uolabo
et querar, et nulla sede quietus eris.

What is all this? It is no combat between two ghosts; it is no combat at all. A ghost is haunting a living man: Ovid is still dead, but Ibis has come to life again. Such phrases as 143 *ueniam...umbra*, 144 *insequar...uultus ossea forma tuos*, 154 *tendam gelidas...in ora manus*, 155 *me uigilans cernes*, 156 *excutiam somnos uisus adesse tuos*, 157 sq. *ante os oculosque uolabo | et querar et nulla sede quietus eris*, are merely comical

[1] *manes* FT; but editors rightly disregard this, as a mere repetition from 140.

if they describe one spectre trying to haunt another spectre; whose form is no less bony, whose fingers are no less cold, and whose capacity for flitting and shrieking is no whit inferior. These are the phrases used when the living are haunted by the dead: Tibull. I 5 51 sq. 'hanc *uolitent* animae circum sua fata *querentes* | semper,' Verg. Aen. IV 386 '*omnibus umbra locis adero*,' Stat. Theb. III 74–7 'te series orbarum excisa domorum | *planctibus adsiduis*, te diro horrore *uolantes* | quinquaginta animae circum *noctesque diesque* | adsilient,' Amm. Marc. XIV 11 17 'sauciabantur eius sensus *circumstridentium* terrore *laruarum*,' Hor. epod. 5 91–6 'quin, ubi perire iussus expiranero, | *nocturnus occurram* furor | *petamque uultus umbra curuis unguibus*, | quae uis deorum est manium, | et *inquietis* assidens praecordiis | pauore *somnos auferam*.' But put all this aside and look simply at verse 153: *Stygiis erumpere nitar ab oris*. If Ibis as well as Ovid is dead, this can only mean that Ovid's ghost will turn tail on Ibis' ghost and make a bolt for the upper air. More marvels yet: we proceed with 159 sq., 'uerbera saeua dabunt sonitum nexaeque colubrae: | conscia fumabunt semper ad ora faces:'—that is, Ovid's ghost will have a Fury to help him, as Valerius Flaccus writes III 386–90 'patet ollis (animis) ianua leti | atque iterum remeare licet; comes una sororum | additur, et pariter terras atque aequora lustrant. | quisque suos sontes inimicaque pectora poenis | implicat, et uaria meritos formidine pulsant:'—and then we come to 161 sq. 'his uiuus furiis agitabere, mortuus isdem, | et breuior poena uita futura tua est.' *uiuus agitabere* and *uita futura est*, and in verse 140 he was already dead and disembodied. O grave, where is thy victory?

Before I edit a work, I read it; and a quarter of a century ago I read the Ibis and consequently noticed this discrepancy. I am the first editor who ever did read the Ibis, and down to this year 1916 I am the last: but it may have been read by some persons other than its editors, and this passage at any rate was read by one scholar before me. Karl Schenkl in 1883, Zeitschr. f. d. oest. Gymn. p. 264, stated briefly the repugnancy which I have just set forth at length: 'v. 142 (140) *saeua sed in manis manibus arma dabo* ist *in manis* auffällig; denn dies setzt voraus, dass der Gegner des Ovid auch als bereits gestorben

gedacht wird, was aber nach den folgenden Versen nicht anzunehmen ist.' The truth of this remark was recognised by Guethling and Merkel, and in their texts of 1884 the offence is removed, but at heavy cost. Guethling writes with Schenkl '*inde meis* manibus arma dabo'; Merkel prefers to maltreat the verse in his own fashion, '*innocuis* manibus arma dabit.' I proposed, not to enfeeble and disfigure a good pentameter, but to put it where it could do no mischief; and I transferred the six verses 135–140 to another seat, leaving 141 sq. to follow upon 134. All inconsistency is thus removed: Ovid says in 131–134 that while his life lasts he will hate his adversary, in 141—158 that when dead he will haunt him as a ghost; the death of Ibis is not contemplated till 161; his funeral follows in 163–172, and only in 173 does he reach the world below.

But who will convey an apprehension of such matters as these to the mind of Mr Ehwald or Mr Owen? They find three editors in succession, Guethling, Merkel, and me, arrested by the same invisible obstacle; and our behaviour inspires them, not with curiosity, not with a wish to read the passage instead of skimming it, but with the impatient wonder of Balaam when his ass persisted in seeing the angel of the Lord. If transposition is proposed, they must of course resist it, but they resist in the dark and have nothing more apposite to urge than the automatic objection, always ready to be reached down from the shelf, that the verses to be separated are inseparable. Mr Ehwald, Burs. Jahresb. vol. 109 p. 286, alleges that the removal of 135–140 is discountenanced by 'der Umstand, dass v. 141 sich eng an v. 140 anschliesst'; and Mr Owen, reddens dictata magistro, writes as follows in the Classical Quarterly VIII p. 254: 'These two couplets (139 sq. and 141 sq.) are closely connected in sense, and should not be separated from one another by such transposition as Mr Housman has introduced into the text in the *Corpus Poetarum Latinorum*. In the first couplet Ovid says that death will not end his wrath, but will furnish his spirit with merciless arms against the spirit of his enemy. This idea is repeated in the next couplet with redundancy characteristic of Ovid.' And that is all: 'the next couplet' is the critics' horizon, and if they read as far as the

third couplet they would lose sight and memory of the first. But to this pretence,—that the couplets 139 sq. and 141 sq. are too closely connected in sense to be separated,—I make the following answer. The couplet 141 sq. cannot be more closely connected with anything in the world than with the verses 131–134 to which I have joined it: if that were its place in the MSS, Messrs Ehwald and Owen would assert, and with better cause, that this bond also was indissoluble and they would appeal, and very plausibly too, to the apt correspondence between *odium* in 134 and *oderit* in 142. And the other couplet, 139 sq., cannot be more closely connected in sense with 141 sq. or with anything else than with the context which I have found for it elsewhere.

That context is one to which I was led by two guides: consideration of the sense, and observation of displacements still to be traced in the MSS. The six verses which I have excised, 135–140, depict Ovid and Ibis as engaged in combat; and the context from which I have excised them, 131–134 and 141–162, exhibits no such picture. But there is a passage which does: 29 sq. *tibi...hostis ero*, 39 *positis, quae sumpsimus, armis*, 43 *pax*, 45 *proelia*, 46 *bella*, 49 *ferro*, 50 *hasta*. And in our MSS the same couplet, 'quam dolor hic umquam spatio euanescere possit, | leniat aut odium tempus et hora meum' is found in both of these two contexts: it is both 41 sq. and 133 sq. In HTX it stands before 135 and also before 43; in F before 135 and also before 39; in V only before 43[1]; in GP only before 135. The last is its true seat, for it is needed to complete the sentence begun in 131 'et prius'; in the earlier place it is superfluous and even detrimental. But the near neighbourhood of the one place is the most appropriate seat in the poem for the verses which in the other place immediately follow it, 135–140; and I set them between 44 and 45.

43 pax erit haec nobis, *donec mihi uita manebit,*
44 cum pecore infirmo quae solet esse lupis.

[1] So says Merkel; Ellis is silent. Mr Owen's note on 40 contains two misstatements.

135 pugnabunt arcu dum Thraces, Iazyges hasta,
dum tepidus Ganges, frigidus Hister erit,
robora dum montes, dum mollia pabula campi,
dum Tiberis liquidas Tuscus habebit aquas,
tecum *bella geram*; *nec mors mihi finiet iras,*
140 saeua sed in manis manibus arma dabit.
45 prima quidem coepto committam proelia uersu,
46 non soleant quamuis hoc pede *bella geri.*

Mr Ehwald, contradicting, as before, in haste and at random, has been so unlucky as to say, Burs. Jahresb. vol. 109 p. 286, 'v. 135–140 nach v. 49'—he means 44—'zu stellen muss schon die enge Zusammengehörigkeit von 43 f. und 45 widerraten.' There exists no 'enge Zusammengehörigkeit' between 43 sq. and 45: they were quite happy together, but they are equally happy apart, and lose nothing by separation. On the contrary, they gain. 'Enge Zusammengehörigkeit' is the name for what my transposition has brought about: the correspondence of 43 with 139 and of 139 with 46; of *donec mihi uita manebit* with *nec mors mihi finiet iras* and of *bella geram* with *bella geri.* But close correspondence is visible to Mr Ehwald where it does not exist and invisible where it does, because not his opinions only, but even his perceptions, are led in chains behind the pen of the copyist.

The three distichs whose place in the poem remains to be considered I will take in their numerical order.

181 sq.

175 Sisyphus est illic saxum uoluensque petensque
quique agitur rapidae uinctus ab orbe rotae,
quaeque gerunt umeris perituras Belides undas,
exulis Aegypti, turba cruenta, nurus.
poma pater Pelopis praesentia quaerit et idem
180 semper eget liquidis semper abundat aquis.
iugeribusque nouem summus qui distat ab imo
uisceraque assiduae debita praebet aui.
hic tibi de Furiis scindet latus una flagello...

In the texts of Burman and Ellis the couplet 181 sq. is enclosed, as above, between full stops. Then it cannot be construed, for it is not a sentence; it is only a conjunction and a relative clause. But Burman and Ellis are used to that: they print as sentences more than forty similar collections of words whose grammatical structure is fragmentary. Sometimes, as here or in 257 sq. 'quique decidit,' it is *que* with a *qui*-clause; sometimes *que* with a noun, as 277 sq. 'sollertique uiro'; sometimes *que* with an *ut*-clause, which may contain a verb, as 331 4 'utque Eurydamas est raptus,' or may not, as 345 sq. 'utque Dryantiadae'; sometimes an *ut*-clause without *que*, whether containing a verb, as 347 sq. 'ut fuit Oetaeo,' or containing none, as 407 sq. 'ut Sinis'; sometimes a *quam*-clause, with a verb, as 489 sq. 'quam periit Cacus,' or without, as 491 sq. 'quam qui tulit.'

Other editors join the couplet to the preceding sentence. It then ceases to be ungrammatical and becomes absurd, for it visits Tityus with the punishment of Tantalus: the construction is 'isque, qui iugeribus nouem summus ab imo distat, poena praesentia quaerit.' It is therefore necessary that 181 sq. should be placed before 179, so that the construction may be 'isque, qui...distat, illic est' (175); but whether the right place for the verses is immediately before 179 or immediately after 176 I see no way to determine. I have therefore said in my note '181 sq. ponendi uidentur inter 176 et 179,' and have made no change in my text.

Mr Ehwald, p. 287, accepts my transposition: but I expect the advent of a genius who will remove all difficulty by the simple and brilliant device of surrounding 179 sq. with marks of parenthesis.

203 sq.

195 nec mortis poenas mors altera finiet huius,
horaque erit tantis ultima nulla malis.
inde ego pauca canam, frondes ut siquis ab Ida
aut summam Libyco de mare carpat aquam.
nam neque, quot flores Sicula nascantur in Hybla
200 quotue ferat, dicam, terra Cilissa crocos,

nec, cum tristis hiemps Aquilonis inhorruit alis,
quam multa fiat grandine canus Athos.
nec mala uoce mea poterunt tua cuncta referri,
ora licet tribuas multiplicata mihi.
tot tibi uae misero uenient talesque ruinae,
ut cogi in lacrimas me quoque posse putem.

In the preceding verses, 173–194, Ovid has described the torments awaiting Ibis after death in the world below. In 195 sq. he adds that these ills will be endless, because there is no second death. And then in 197 he says that he will relate a few of them. He has already related a few of them, and he never relates any more. The ills which he proceeds to relate, and which fill the greater part of the poem, are ills which Ibis is to suffer in this world, not in the next. If the sketch of Ibis' sufferings in the next world had been preceded by a general prophecy of his sufferings in this, it would have been possible, though awkward, to include these in the reference of *inde*. But now it is not even possible, for the only woes in this world yet prophesied to Ibis are his persecution by Ovid's ghost (if Ovid dies before him) and the maltreatment of his dead body; and the catalogue filling 251–638 is no selection from these.

The couplet 203 sq. '*nec* mala...mihi' is quite well suited to its present place, after the couplet 201 sq. '*nec* cum...Athos'; but it is not needed there, for the comparisons may close the period, as in Verg. georg. II 105–8, Ouid. ex Pont. IV 2 7–10, Mart. XII 57 15–7. If placed before 197, after the couplet 195 sq. '*nec* mortis...malis,' it will provide *inde* with the reference it requires: *mala...tua cuncta*. An editor who, like Ellis, divides the poem into paragraphs, should begin a new paragraph not only after 126 and 250 but after 196, and should begin it with 203.

Merkel wrote in 1837 'nescio quid Heinsium commouerit, ut in schedis tentaret: *Iliaca canas frondes* et *Laomedontea frondes ut si quis*.' But with advancing years he grew less obtuse, and by 1884 his eyes had been opened to Heinsius' motive: 'offendor disticho 197 198. *Inde* quod legimus,

referri non potest ad *tanta mala* quae dicuntur v. 196 et enarrantur inde a v. 161 : non sunt ea *cuncta*, quae indicantur v. 203, unde partem deprompturus est poeta.'

409 sq.

405 ut pronepos, Saturne, tuus, quem reddere uitam
urbe Coronides uidit ab ipse sua,
ut Sinis et Sciron et cum Polypemone natus
quique homo parte sui parte iuuencus erat,
quique trabes pressas ab humo mittebat in auras
410 aequoris aspiciens huius et huius aquas,
quaeque Ceres laeto uidit pereuntia uultu
corpora Thesea Cercyonea manu.

'May you perish'—*pereas* in 365 is the principal verb of the sentence—'like Periphetes, like Sinis and Sciron and Procrustes with his father Polypemon and the Minotaur and Pityocamptes and Cercyon.' But Sinis and Pityocamptes were one and the same, Σίνις ὁ καὶ Πιτυοκάμπτης. So we are assured, not only by many authors in many places, but by Ovid himself in a similar catalogue of the malefactors slain by Theseus, met. VII 440–2 'ille Sinis, magnis male uiribus usus, | qui poterat curuare trabes et agebat ab alto | ad terram late sparsuras corpora pinus.' There is indeed one passage where a Christian writer of the 12th century has taken the two names for two persons, Eustath. ad Iliad. p. 158 *αἱ ἱστορίαι...περιάδουσαι καὶ αὐτὸν* (Σίνιν), *καθὰ καὶ τὸν Σκείρωνα καὶ τὸν Πιτυοκάμπτην καὶ τὸν Κάκον καὶ τὸν Λίβυν Ἀνταῖον καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους*; but the error was evidently rare and we have seen that Ovid did not share it.

For this reason I proposed to place 409 sq. after 396 :

393 ut iacet Aonio luctator ab hospite fusus
qui, mirum, uictor, cum cecidisset, erat,
ut quos Antaei fortes pressere lacerti,
396 quosque ferae morti Lemnia claua dedit
409 quique trabes pressas ab humo mittebat in auras
410 aequoris aspiciens huius et huius aquas.

The construction will then be 'quos ferae morti dedit Lemnia claua deditque is qui trabes mittebat in auras': may you perish like the victims of Antaeus, of Periphetes, and of Sinis. The next distich, 397 sq., likewise ends with *aquas* (as do 142 and 144 with *tuos*, 610 and 612 with *manus*), and this may have had something to do with the omission and consequent transposition of 409 sq.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

ARISTOPHANICA.

Ach. 338.

> *ἀλλὰ νυνὶ λέγ' εἴ σοι δοκεῖ τόν τε Λακε-*
> *δαιμόνιον αὐτὸν ὅ τι τῷ τρόπῳ σου 'στὶ φίλον.*

The only word which is clearly wrong in this couplet is *αὐτόν*. Is it a corruption of *εἶπον*? This would correct the passage with the least expense, and all the rest is at least construable, but perhaps really Elmsley's *λέγ' ὅτι σοι δοκεῖ*, combined with Blaydes' *αἴνεσον ὅτῳ τρόπῳ σοῦστι φίλον*, is more likely to hit the truth. Blaydes I say, not Hall and Geldart; see the former scholar's edition of 1886, page xvii. *ὅτῳ τρόπῳ* is as old as Scaliger.

Ach. 383.

> *νῦν οὖν με πρῶτον πρὶν λέγειν ἐάσατε*
> *ἐνσκευάσασθαί μ' οἷον ἀθλιώτατον.*

435. *ὦ Ζεῦ διόπτα καὶ κατόπτα πανταχῇ,*
ἐνσκευάσασθαί μ' οἷον ἀθλιώτατον.

The repetition of the second line in these couplets has displeased many: some would omit 384, but that leaves *ἐάσατε* without any meaning that I can see: others 436, but, though more is to be said for this, it still seems improbable that 435 should be left without any sequel, and it would be a curious accident if a spurious line came in so pat to fill up the construction in so idiomatic a manner. Yet Aristophanes would hardly have repeated the line in this way unless there had been some special reason for it; he is not in the habit of repeating lines, whatever Mr Rogers may say on *Knights* 96. What then is the point? This, I take it; the line is clearly a parody of Euripides, and the only way of translating 384 at

any rate is to take *με* as equivalent to *ἐμαυτόν*. This is very rarely done in tragedy, and to make it worse *με* is governed by *ἐνσκευάσασθαι*, which, being a verb "connected with the toilet," would not be expected to have an accusative after it at all. Thus *ἐνσκευάζομαί με* is doubly odd, and it is no wonder that the comic poet should make fun of it, as he did of Sophocles' *μὴ ψεῦσον*. But it is quite probable that he is purposely mistaking the construction of Euripides, as comedians are fond of pretending to misunderstand their victims.

Ach. 801.

ΔΙ. *τρώγοις ἂν ἐρεβίνθους;* ΚΟ. *κοὶ κοὶ κοῖ.*
ΔΙ. *τί δαί; φιβάλεως ἰσχάδας;* ΚΟ. *κοὶ κοῖ.*
ΔΙ. *τί δαί; σῦκα τρώγοις ἂν αὐτός;* ΚΟ. *κοὶ κοῖ.*

The last of these lines can no longer be ejected, since it was read in the papyrus of Hermupolis, but as there remain of it only four letters in that papyrus we do not know how it ran. That it should begin with *τί δέ; σῦκα τρώγοις* is pretty obvious, and there is MS. authority for this; in this string of doubles ententes *σῦκα* could not be omitted, and cf. Aristotle, *Hist. An.* viii 21, where the philosopher, speaking of swine, says: *ἄριστον δὲ πρὸς τὸ πιαίνειν καὶ τρέφειν οἱ ἐρέβινθοι καὶ τὰ σῦκα.* Now the *φιβάλεως ἰσχάδας* are so called from a certain district, either of Attica or Megara, but they are themselves a variety of *σῦκα;* hence it is practically certain that when the poet goes on to *σῦκα* in the next line he must have spoken of some particular kind, not of *σῦκα* in general. If *φιβάλεως* means Megarian, though this is of course uncertain, *σῦκα τρώγοις* 'Αττίκ' *ἄν;* may have been the original. If 'Αττικὰ was omitted and then added in the margin or above the line, it might easily get into the text in a depraved state and in the wrong place, as *αὐτίκα* for instance, and then *αὖτις*. There is clearly considerable point in asking the Megarian girls first if they will eat Megarian and then Attic figs.

Ach. 1093.

ὀρχηστρίδες τὰ φίλταθ' 'Αρμοδίου καλαί.

The number of proposals made to deal with the line as if it

were corrupt is truly startling, and the number of distinguished scholars who find it incredible would frighten me off its defence if I did not know of what even distinguished scholars are capable in the face of Aristophanic jests. Mr Rogers is the only one of the lot, so far as I know, who has made what I should have thought the obvious remark that it is a comic misquotation or perversion of the scolion, in which the words are deliberately misunderstood after the fashion of such poets. Aristophanes, or even perhaps some one before him, saw the possibility of taking the words *φίλταθ' Ἁρμόδι' οὐ* as *φίλτατα Ἁρμοδίου*, and no reverence for any national hymn or national hero was going to stop him from having his fling. Whether Harmodius really was or was not addicted to the fair sex is a question which is not to the point; comedy must not be treated as a historic document.

The English Aristophanes, for the creator of Falstaff deserves that title better than does any other man, has played a similar prank. The fourth scene of the fourth act of the second part of Marlowe's *Tamburlaine the Great* begins with the glorious rant:

> Holla, ye pampered jades of Asia!
> What! can ye draw but twenty miles a day?

Ancient Pistol in *Henry IV*, Part II, Act ii, Sc. iv, reproduces it thus:

> These be good humours indeed! Shall pack-horses,
> And hollow pampered jades of Asia
> Which cannot go but thirty miles a day,
> Compare with Caesars and with Cannibals
> And Trojan Greeks?

One imagines the commentator of the future objecting that "hollow jades" is nonsense, and proposing to read "yellow," or "highlow," or "mallow-pampered," for horses can be fed on mallows, I presume, or "pillion-hampered," to which a plentiful lack of sense combined with overmuch belief in the virtues of palaeography might easily lead him. If Aristophanes could have seen the pother made over his innocent jest, he would not

have said "These be good humours" but something not to be here put down.

Ach. 1180.

> καὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς κατέαγε περὶ λίθῳ πεσών,
> καὶ Γοργόν' ἠξήγειρεν ἐκ τῆς ἀσπίδος,
> πτίλον δὲ τὸ μέγα κομπολακύθου πεσὼν
> πρὸς ταῖς πέτραισι δεινὸν ἐξηύδα μέλος·
> "ὦ κλεινὸν ὄμμα, νῦν πανύστατόν σ' ἰδὼν
> λείπω φάος γε τοὐμόν, οὐκέτ' εἰμ' ἐγώ."

Line 1181 was ejected by Dobree as being interpolated in a corrupt form from 574; certainly in 574 ἐκ τοῦ σάγματος makes sense with ἐξήγειρεν, whereas ἐκ τῆς ἀσπίδος is neither sense nor good nonsense. There is more probability to my mind in the idea that it is genuine here but corrupt. Brunck proposed ἐξήραξεν, Seager ἐξήρειξεν, but these both imply that the Gorgon was fixed on to the shield in such a way that it could be knocked off; is it not more likely that it was painted? Indeed 1095 proves that it was, μεγάλην ἐπεγράφου τὴν Γοργόνα. The right word for smearing, or obliterating a painting in any way, would be ἐξήλειψεν or ἐξήλειφεν; either tense is possible, palaeographically the imperfect is preferable, on other grounds perhaps the aorist.

After writing this I find that Dobree actually said himself of the line "Tolerari posset si ἐξήλειψε, ἐξέτριψε, etc. restitueres." But this observation has not been attended to as it deserved to be, so I will let my own stand.

At the end of 1182 MSS. vary between πεσὼν and πεσόν; on the face of it πεσὼν is the more honest reading, and the change to πεσὸν is only one of those innumerable attempts to restore grammar without thinking of the sense. Elmsley indeed insisted that πτίλον πεσὸν was a nominativus pendens. "Vide Plut. 277, et meam annotationem ad v. 316. Noster apud Pollucem vii 67 ἀλλὰ τὸ στρόφιον λυθέν, τὰ κάρυά μοὐξέπίπτε." It cannot be denied that a nominativus pendens is possible, and yet it neither seems to me likely in itself here nor does it account for the variant πεσών. Bergk appears to me unquestionably right in assuming that πεσὼν has got in from

above; he proposes λιπὼν but this is a feeble word and anticipates unduly the λείπω of 1185. Better θενών; cf. *Birds* 54. θένε τὴν πέτραν, 1613, ἐκκόψει τὸν ὀφθαλμὸν θενών, and the πτίλον is in some sense the ὄμμα of Lamachus, but I lay no stress on these passages as they are not at all strictly parallel.

The κλεινὸν ὄμμα is certainly the πτίλον, I think, for cf. *Knights* 1250:

> ὦ στέφανε, χαίρων ἄπιθι, κεἴ σ' ἄκων ἐγὼ
> λείπω,

where Cleon takes leave of his crown exactly as Lamachus does of his feather.

Birds 1192.

> ἀέρα περινέφελον ὃν Ἔρεβος ἐτέκετο.

The corresponding line is:

> μηδέ τιν' ἱερόθυτον ἀνὰ δάπεδον ἔτι.

Consequently metre demands ἔτεκε, because the system must end with ἔτι and so the two short syllables at the end of ἐτέκετο cannot stand, according to Seidler.

Birds 1714.

> πάλλων κεραυνὸν πτεροφόρον Διὸς βέλος.

And again 1756

> φῦλα πάντα συννόμων πτεροφόρα.

In both lines it would be better, I think, to accent πτερόφορον, πτερόφορα. With the paroxytone accent the meaning is "carrying wings," as if the wings were a burden, but obviously they are on the contrary that which buoys a thing up. The popular theory seems to have been that a feather had a natural gravitation upwards; a bird in fact flew like an air-ship rather than like an aeroplane. Thus Ovid remarks of bats:

> Non illas pluma levavit,
> Sustinuere tamen se perlucentibus alis. (*Met.* iv. 410.)

He evidently thinks it strange that a wing without feathers should be any use for flight at all. Aristotle saw no difficulty

in this, however; *de Partibus* iv 13 ad fin. Cf. no. 63 of this Journal, p. 65.

Lys. 720.

> *τὴν μέν γε πρώτην διαλέγουσαν τὴν ὀπὴν*
> *κατέλαβον ᾗ τοῦ Πανός ἐστι ταὐλίον.*

The Scholiast says *διαλέγουσαν*: *διορύττουσαν, κακεμφάτως.* Hesychius, *διαλέξαι*: *διορύξαι.* Suidas, *διαλέγου*: *διορύττου.* These glosses probably come from our passage, as Stephanus remarks of the former, and he restores *διαλέγουσαν*: *διορύττουσαν* in the latter. Thus the reading is very old, but is none the less corrupt; there is no shred of evidence that I can find to shew that *λέγω* could ever mean *ὀρύττω*. Read *διαπλέκουσαν*, not, I think, *-οῦσαν*, and consult 152; it is not the only double entente in this speech. *ὀπὴ* occurs in close anatomical proximity in Michael Ephesius on Aristotle *de Gen. An.* page 54, lines 29—32, in Hayduck's edition, but there in a common medical usage for any narrow passage.

διεσπλεκωμένῃ. ἔχει δὲ τὴν παραγωγὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ πλέκω καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ πλέγμα. Schol. *Plutus* 1082.

Cf. the corruption of *πλόκον* to *λόγον* at Eur. *Hipp.* 514.

Thesm. 19.

> *διὰ τὴν χοάνην οὖν μήτ' ἀκούω μήθ' ὁρῶ;*

Sc. *per anum.* Cf. 57, 62.

Frogs 84.

> *ἀγαθὸς ποιητὴς καὶ ποθεινὸς τοῖς φίλοις.*

The Kingdom of Heaven is likely to be uncomfortably crowded by Aristophanic scholars if simplicity and innocence of heart are really passports to that paradise. Three at least now living have put in this line as evidence of the charming character of Agathon; them let us suffer to blush unseen, but Dobree, positively Dobree himself, following a stupid scholiast, thought of reading *σοφοῖς* for *φίλοις*. Is it really necessary to remark that *ποθεινὸς* is a *vox amatoria*, and that so far from being a compliment to Agathon this line is almost a slur upon his reputation? The Athenian audience received it with a scream

of laughter, but then the Jewish Aristophanes has truly remarked that the poet himself was "ein blinder Heide, und sein Publikum zu Athen hatte zwar eine klassische Erziehung genossen, wusste aber wenig von Sittlichkeit."

Frogs 551.

ἑκκαίδεκ' ἄρτους κατέφαγ' ἡμῶν.

The number sixteen for some unexplained and inexplicable reason became a comic number in Greek; so Rabelais is extraordinarily fond of seventy-eight, especially in his later books. Do not invoke the Pythagoreans, nor argue that, as 78 is the sum of the first 12 numbers, so 16 is 12 plus the number of the elements of the tetractys, which is itself the sum of those four, and that both have some profound significance; they are both just Pantagruelian nonsense. See *Plutus* 195, Plato com. *Phaon* 2, Menander Ἡλόκιον 1, Ψευδηρακλῆς 4, Alexis ἐν Κυπρίῳ apud Athenaeum iii 81, Lucian *ad dicentem Prometheus es* 3, *Prometheus* 20, *Deor. Dial.* i 1, *Timon* 23, 49, *Hermotimus* 80, *Jup. Confutatus* 17, *Jup. Trag.* 11, 15, *Somnium* 12, 29, *Philopseudes* 8, 14.

Frogs 1056.

ἦν οὖν σὺ λέγῃς Λυκαβηττοὺς
καὶ Παρνασσὸν ἡμῖν μεγέθη, τοῦτ' ἐστὶ τὸ χρηστα διδάσκειν,
ὃν χρῆν φράζειν ἀνθρωπείως;

There are several objections to ὅν; first, the argument is that "all poets ought χρηστὰ λέγειν; if *you*, Aeschylus, talk mountains, is that the way to do it? *the poet* ought to talk like a human being." But ὁν does not mean "the poet" in general, it can only refer to σύ. I should not think this serious by itself; after all it is sense to say "you who ought, &c.," but still strict logic does not demand σὺ ὃν χρῆν but something else. Perhaps it was the perception of this partly that caused Blaydes to read οὐ χρὴ as an interrogation, but it is clear to almost every editor that Fritzsche is right in emending χρὴ to χρῆν. Secondly φράζειν has nothing to govern, but this absolute use of it is extremely rare. Thirdly the antithesis is between mountains and morals, there is a strong emphasis on

χρηστὰ and we should expect something about that. I think therefore that probably ἀχρῆν = ἃ ἐχρῆν should be restored. It certainly makes better sense; there is no such reason why a man should talk ἀνθρωπείως if he is talking about unpractical subjects, but if he is speaking of things useful to man, *then* he ought to speak so as to be understanded of the people.

Frogs 1434.

ὁ μὲν σοφῶς γὰρ εἶπεν ὁ δ' ἕτερος σαφῶς.

I do not see how there can be any real doubt about the meaning of this line. Which of the two tragedians has spoken σαφῶς about Alcibiades? Obviously Euripides, who has described him in sharp prosy antitheses like a rhetorician. Aeschylus after his fashion answers with a parable about a lion cub, σοφῶς, like a poet of genius, for σοφὸς is the regular epithet for such an one. Cf. 1413, where Dionysus cannot deny the genius of Aeschylus, ἡγοῦμαι σοφόν, and yet has a delight in Euripides of which he is naturally a little ashamed.

So the scholiast is right, I think: σοφῶς μὲν ὁ Αἰσχύλος σαφῶς δὲ ὁ Εὐριπίδης.

Frogs 1524.

φαίνετε τοίνυν ὑμεῖς τούτῳ
λαμπάδας ἱράς.

"Show torches to him"! no, light the way for him with torches, λαμπάσιν ἱραῖς. The dative was corrupted into accusative by some sciolist who knew what φαίνω habitually governs, and who thought to restore the grammar without thinking about the sense. The scholiast desperately explains it as being ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀνάπτετε.

ARTHUR PLATT.

ARISTOTELICA.

Topics 1. 15. 106 b 35 *εἰ ὑγιεινὸν τὸ μὲν ὑγιείας ποιητικὸν <ὄν>, τὸ δὲ φυλακτικόν, τὸ δὲ σημαντικόν, as being, because it is, productive of health.*

ib. 3. 1. 116 a 14 *ὃ μᾶλλον ἂν ἕλοιτο ὁ φρόνιμος ἢ ὁ ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ ἢ ὁ νόμος ὁ ὀρθὸς ἢ οἱ σπουδαῖοι περὶ ἕκαστα.*

It is surely clear that by a quite common confusion *νόμος* has been written for *λόγος*. In *Eth.* 5. 6. 1134 a 35 for instance MSS. vary between *λόγον* and *νόμον*. The *φρόνιμος* and the (*ὀρθὸς*) *λόγος* are just as in *Eth.* 2. 6. 1107 a 1.

ib. 37 *καὶ εἰ μηδὲν ἡμῖν <πλέον> μέλλει ἔσεσθαι* is the meaning and should be the phrase.

ib. 6. 4. 141 b 10 *μάλιστα γὰρ τὸ στερεὸν ὑπὸ τὴν αἴσθησιν πίπτει ἐπιπέδου, τὸ δ' ἐπίπεδον μᾶλλον τῆς γραμμῆς.*

It can hardly be that *μάλιστα* has really till now escaped correction to *μᾶλλον*, but in any case it shows what copyists and editors will do.

ib. 8. 5. 159 b 35 *στοχάζονται γὰρ ὡς ἂν εἴπειεν ὁ θέμενος.*

For *ὡς* read *ὧν*, as in the very next line *φανερὸν τίνων στοχαστέον.*

ib. 9. 17. 175 b 39 *εἰ τὰ δύο ἐρωτήματα μὴ ἓν ποιεῖ τις ἐρώτημα, οὐδ' ἄν...ἐγίνετο παραλογισμός.*

οὐδ' ἂν ἐγίνετο should be evidence to anybody that *ποιεῖ* is a mistake for *ἐποίει.*

ib. 31. 181 b 25 *περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀπαγόντων εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ πολλάκις εἰπεῖν φανερὸν ὡς κ.τ.λ.*

So too anyone might see that *εἰς τὸ αὐτὸ πολλάκις εἰπεῖν* is *εἰς τὸ <τὸ> αὐτὸ πολλάκις εἰπεῖν.*

ib. 32. 182 a 15 *ξύλον δ' εἰπεῖν οὗτος..., οὐδὲν διαφέρει.*

No doubt *ξύλον δ' < εἰ > εἶπεν οὗτος.*

ib. 34. 183 a 37 *εὑρεῖν δύναμίν τινα συλλογιστικὴν περὶ τοῦ προβλήματος ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὡς ἐνδοξοτάτων.*

ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων is such a regular phrase that we ought, if we can, to make *τῶν ὑπαρχόντων* here the substantive, so to speak, and *ὡς ἐνδοξοτάτων* the qualifying epithet, not to treat *ὑπαρχόντων* as itself the qualifying adjectival word. We must read then *τῶν ὑπαρχόντων < τῶν > ὡς ἐνδοξοτάτων.*

ib. 183 b 16 Perhaps *ὑμᾶς* (not *ἡμᾶς*), as in 184 b 6.

ib. 36 *τῶν περὶ τοὺς ἐριστικοὺς λόγους μισθαρνούντων ὁμοία τις ἦν ἡ παίδευσις τῇ Γοργίου πραγματείᾳ· λόγους γὰρ οἱ μὲν ῥητορικούς, οἱ δὲ ἐρωτητικοὺς ἐδίδοσαν ἐκμανθάνειν, εἰς οὓς πλειστάκις ἐμπίπτειν ᾠήθησαν ἑκάτεροι τοὺς ἀλλήλων λόγους.*

Should not *οἱ μέν* be *ὁ μέν*, Gorgias? *ἑκάτεροι* does not necessarily imply two plurals. It may refer to one man and several, put side by side, as *οὐδετέρους* does in Dem. 21. 86 and *ὁπότεροι* Plato *Apol.* end.

ib. 184 b 6 *πάντων ὑμῶν ἢ τῶν ἠκροαμένων.*

ὑμεῖς and *οἱ ἠκροαμένοι* being pretty clearly the same persons, omit *ἤ* as a dittograph of *ν* (NH). Just above in b 2 the *ἤ* in *ἀλλ' ἤ* of most MSS. and editions is equally wrong, and *ἀλλά* alone is needed.

Metaphysics 1. 3. 983 b 17 *δεῖ γὰρ εἶναί τινα φύσιν κ.τ.λ.*

This, like what precedes it, should be part of what is said (*φασίν* line 11) by certain persons, but the finite verb *δεῖ* makes this difficult. The least change would be to read *δεῖν*; but, as *δεῖ* or *δεῖν* is not really very suitable in sense here, it seems probable that *δεῖ* is a mistake for *ἀεί*. See Christ's Preface, p. vii, and cf. 984 a 9 *ταῦτα γὰρ ἀεὶ διαμένειν κ.τ.λ.*

ib. 984 b 32 *ἐξέστω κρίνειν ὕστερον.*

Is the imperative in place, or should we read *ἔξεσται*? *ἐστί, ἔσται, ἔστω* are sometimes confused.

ib. 1. 5. 985 b 31 *ἔτι δὲ τῶν ἁρμονιῶν ἐν ἀριθμοῖς ὁρῶντες τὰ πάθη καὶ τοὺς λόγους.*

I suspect Aristotle wrote *τῶν ἀριθμῶν ἐν ἁρμονίαις*. According to the theory *ἁρμονίαι* are *πάθη καὶ λόγοι* of numbers; they would hardly be said themselves to have *πάθη*, and *ἐν ἀριθμοῖς* is not natural. See the index of Christ or Bonitz s.v. *λόγος*, and cf. 13 (N). 3. 1090 a 24 *τὰ πάθη τὰ τῶν ἀριθμῶν ἐν ἁρμονίᾳ ὑπάρχει.*

ib. 986 b 21 *Ξενοφάνης δ' <ὁ> πρῶτος τούτων ἐνίσας*, changing *δέ* to *δ' ὁ*? or *Ξ. δὲ πρότερον*?

ib. 987 a 7 *παρὰ δὲ <ἑτέρων> τινῶν*, as in lines 16, 28, and elsewhere?

ib. 8. 988 b 29 With *τὸ τιθέναι* and *τὸ λέγειν* we cannot understand anything like *ἁμάρτημά ἐστι* (Bonitz) because of *ἐπισκεψάμενοι* following. The only possible construction, but a strange one, is to make them accusatives dependent on *ἁμαρτάνουσιν* (24). Should we read *τῷ* in both cases? The datives in Thuc. 3. 40. 2 are datives of motive or cause and not quite parallel.

ib. 9. 990 b 19 *συμβαίνει γὰρ μὴ εἶναι τὴν δυαδα πρώτην ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀριθμόν, καὶ τὸ πρός τι τοῦ καθ' αὑτό.*

The genitive *τοῦ* has no construction until for *πρώτην* we substitute *προτέραν*, a word better in itself. The confusion is frequent. Cf. on *Sop.* 6. 4. 141 *b* 10.

ib. 991 a 24 *ἐνδέχεται γὰρ καὶ εἶναι καὶ γίνεσθαι ὅμοιον ὁτιοῦν καὶ μὴ εἰκαζόμενον πρὸς ἐκεῖνο.*

Similarly here *ἐκεῖνο* has nothing to refer to, until we read *ὁτῳοῦν.*

ib. 992 b 18 *ὅλως τε τὸ τῶν ὄντων ζητεῖν στοιχεῖα μὴ διελόντας πολλαχῶς λεγομένων ἀδύνατον εὑρεῖν.*

The two infinitives cannot stand together. Should we read *τὰ τῶν ὄντων ζητοῦντας στοιχεῖα*? *ζητοῦντας* comes in the following line, *τὸ τῶν ὄντων ἁπάντων τὰ στοιχεῖα ζητεῖν ἢ οἴεσθαι ἔχειν οὐκ ἀληθές* three lines below, and our *τὸ ζητεῖν* may be due by mistake to the other one. Possibly *ζητεῖν* should be simply omitted and *τό* changed to *τα.*

In the same passage perhaps *ἀλλ', εἴπερ, <περὶ> τῶν οὐσιῶν μόνον ἐνδέχεται*; but no doubt *τὰ στοιχεῖα* can be supplied by the mind.

1 A (A *ἔλαττον*). 1. 993 b 12 *ὧν ἄν τις κοινώσαιτο ταῖς δόξαις.*

Is the dative possible? The only dative that belongs to *κοινοῦν* and *κοινοῦσθαι* is that of the other person, not of the thing shared or communicated. Presumably then *τὰς δόξας.*

ib. 2. 994 a 25 *τὸ μὲν οὖν* for *ὡς μὲν οὖν*? Cf. *τὸ δέ* in 31. *ὡς* wrongly anticipated from the next line.

2. 1. 995 a 32 Should not *ἀμφοτέρως* be *ἀμφοτέροις*?

ib. 2. 996 b 31—33 There should certainly be a full stop at *προτάσεις* and the mark of a question after *νῦν.*

ib. 997 a 5 *καὶ <αἱ> ἄλλαι τέχναι.*

ib. 6. 1003 a 10 *εἰ δ' ἔσται τόδε τι καὶ ἐκθέσθαι τὸ κοινῇ κατηγορούμενον, πολλὰ ἔσται ζῷα ὁ Σωκράτης αὐτός τε καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ τὸ ζῷον, εἴπερ σημαίνει ἕκαστον τόδε τι καὶ ἕν.*

The last words and the want of propriety in the compound *ἐκθέσθαι* point distinctly to *εἰ δ' ἔσται τόδε τι καὶ ἓν θέσθαι τὸ κ. κ.*

3. 2. 1003 b 12 *<περὶ> τῶν καθ' ἓν λεγομένων* is alone Greek with *θεωρῆσαι*, as in a 25 and b 35.

3. 4. 1006 a 2 *πολλοὶ καὶ τῶν περὶ φύσεως.*

Is not a participle in the genitive plural missing, e.g. *θεωρούντων*?

3. 5. 1010 a 37 *οὐ γάρ ἔστιν εἰς ὅτι μεταβάλλει.*

The idiomatic *μεταβαλεῖ* will be better. So in 6. 1011 a 5 *τίς ὁ κρίνων* should be *τίς ὁ κρινῶν*, like *τὸν κρινοῦντα*, and *μένει* in 11. 6. 1063 a 24 *μενεῖ.*

ib. 1011 a 15 *οἱ δ' ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τὴν βίαν μόνον ζητοῦντες ἀδύνατον ζητοῦσιν· ἐναντία γὰρ εἰπεῖν ἀξιοῦσιν εὐθὺς ἐναντία λέγοντες.*

The obscurity and difficulty of these last words I believe to be due to the loss of a negative, *<οὐκ> ἀξιοῦσι.* The

meaning is that they rely on the coercive force of reasoning and will not allow their adversary to be in any way inconsistent, while yet their very thesis is that a thing can both be and not be, that is that two inconsistent statements can both be true. But then no argument proves anything, for the conclusion and the opposite of the conclusion may both be true.

4. 2. 1014 a 23 *ὅδε ὁ οἰκοδομῶν*? 25 proves nothing, but suggests where *οἰκοδόμος* came from.

ib. a 31 *τὰ μόρια ὁμοειδῆ, οἷον ὕδατος τὸ μόριον ὕδωρ, ἀλλ' οὐ τῆς συλλαβῆς <συλλαβή>*?

Hist. An. 3. 20. 521 b 29 *τὸ μὲν οὖν τῶν μὴ ἀμφωδόντων γάλα πήγνυται, διὸ καὶ τυρεύεται <τὸ> τῶν ἡμέρων.*

ib. 522 a 33 *οὐδέ*, not *οὔτε*.

ib. 5. 5. 541 a 29 *κἀκ* (for *καὶ*) *τῆς φωνῆς*?

ib. 9. 11. 615 a 30 *μένει χρόνον οὐκ ἐλάττονα ἢ ὅσον πλέθρον διέλθοι τις.*

Not only must *ἄν* be added to *διέλθοι* (probably after *πλέθρον*), but the accusative *ὅσον* can hardly be right. It is in itself wrong and attraction does not take this form; the mistake is probably due to the other accusatives. Read *ὅσῳ*.

De Part. An. 1. 1. 641 a 34 *εἰ γὰρ περὶ πάσης (ψυχῆς ἡ φυσικὴ λέγει), οὐδεμία λείπεται παρὰ τὴν φυσικὴν ἐπιστήμην φιλοσοφία. ὁ γὰρ νοῦς τῶν νοητῶν. ὥστε περὶ πάντων ἡ φυσικὴ γνῶσις ἂν εἴη· τῆς γὰρ αὐτῆς περὶ νοῦ καὶ τοῦ νοητοῦ θεωρῆσαι, εἴπερ πρὸς ἄλληλα.*

ὁ γὰρ νοῦς τῶν νοητῶν has no sense where it stands, but it would be excellently in place after *πρὸς ἄλληλα*.

ib. 1. 4. 644 a 12 *ἀπορήσειε δ' ἄν τις διὰ τί οὐκ ἄνωθεν ἑνὶ ὀνόματι ἐμπεριλαβόντες ἅμα ἓν γένος ἄμφω προσηγόρευσαν οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὃ περιέχει τά τε ἔνυδρα καὶ τὰ πτηνὰ τῶν ζῴων.*

The present tense *περιέχει* is quite unsuitable both to a name which *ex hypothesi* does not exist and to a *γένος* which according to Aristotle does not exist either. Whether *ὅ* refers to *γένος* or *ὀνόματι* may be doubted. The future

περιέξει is the idiomatic tense to use, although the main verb is in the past, like *ναυτικὸν παρεσκεύαζον ὅτι πέμψουσιν*. There is a similar mistake in 2. 10. 655 b 30 *ἥ τε δέχονται* (read *δέξονται*) *τὴν τροφὴν καὶ ᾗ τὸ περίττωμα ἀφήσουσιν*.

ib. 2. 16. 659 b 4 *ὥστε μηθὲν ἂν εἰπεῖν ἔχειν ῥῖνας.*

μηθέν should of course be *μηθέν'*. I can hardly believe that this and the preceding mistake have not been corrected by someone since the last text (Langkavel), now fifty years old.

De An. Mot. 1. 2. 698 b 16 *εἰ γὰρ ὑποδώσει ἀεί, οἷον τοῖς* $\frac{\mu\upsilon\sigma\grave{\iota}\nu}{\pi o\sigma\grave{\iota}}$ *τοῖς ἐν τῇ γῇ ἢ τοῖς ἐν τῇ ἄμμῳ πορευομένοις, οὐ πρόεισιν.*

Mr Farquharson in his recent translation proposes *τοῖς μυσὶν ἐν τῇ ζειᾷ mice walking in grain*. It is difficult to see why such an out-of-the-way comparison should have been used, even if we think of the proverbial but obscure *μῦς ἐν πίττῃ*. I greatly prefer the other MS. reading *ποσί*, and for *ἐν τῇ γῇ* (in which *γῇ* is said to be somewhat doubtful in E) I suggest *ἐν πηλῷ* or *ἐν τῷ πηλῷ*. The *τοῖς* before *ἐν* is wanting in some MSS. Perhaps then *οἷον τοῖς ποσὶν ἐν τῷ πηλῷ*. *τ, γ, π* are well known to get confused (τ, Γ, π).

ib. 7. 701 a 21 *εἰ ἱμάτιον ἔσται, ἀνάγκη εἶναι τόδε πρῶτον (so and so must exist first)· εἰ δὲ τόδε, τόδε* (i.e. a third thing before the second)

This being the meaning, *πρῶτον* must by a common mistake stand for *πρότερον*. The very next words show that the thing in question is not *πρῶτον*, for another must precede it.

ib. 701 a 37 *τῶν δ' ὀρεγομένων πράττειν τὰ μὲν δι' ἐπιθυμίαν ἢ θυμόν, τὰ δὲ δι' ὄρεξιν ἢ βούλησιν τὰ μὲν ποιοῦσι, τὰ δὲ πράττουσιν.*

The creatures that act *δι' ἐπιθυμίαν ἢ θυμόν* are no doubt animals and children, those that act *δι' ὄρεξιν ἢ βούλησιν* older human beings. But in what sense is *ὄρεξις* used of the latter? *ὄρεξις* in Aristotle is a genus, of which *ἐπιθυμία*, *θυμός*, and *βούλησις* are the three species; yet here it

seems to be a species side by side with *βούλησις*, and we should be at a loss to say what is its genus. < *ἄλογον* > *ὄρεξιν ἡ βούλησιν* would make sense and agree with Aristotle's language elsewhere, or we might conceivably take *ὄρεξιν* alone as = *ἄλογον ὄρεξιν*, but neither of these seems very probable. If *ὄρεξιν* is a mistake for some other word, it is hard to see what that word can be. *προαίρεσις* never fits well into the above classification, for, though it is expressly called an *ὄρεξις*, it is not the same as any of the three species; but I do not suggest it as likely.

ib. 701 b 4 *τὸ ἀμάξιον, ὅπερ ὀχούμενον αὐτὸ κινεῖ κ.τ.λ.*

This makes no sense and is a misuse of *ὅσπερ*. No doubt we should read *τὸ ἀμάξιον· ὁ γὰρ ὀχούμενος κ.τ.λ.* For confusion of *γ* and *π* see above on 698 b 16. (So too independently of me Mr W. D. Ross.)

ib. 8. 701 b 36 The clause *ἀλλὰ λανθάνει περὶ τὰ μικρὰ τοῦτο συμβαῖνον* seems out of place after the words *τὸ μὲν γὰρ λυπηρὸν φευκτόν, τὸ δ' ἡδὺ διωκτόν*. Either of the two clauses might be moved slightly and a better sequence secured, e.g. *ἀλλά...συμβαῖνον* might follow *ψύξις* in the preceding line.

ib. 10. 703 a 4 *κατὰ μὲν οὖν τὸν λόγον τὸν λεγοντα τὴν αἰτίαν τῆς κινήσεως ἐστὶν ἡ ὄρεξις τὸ μέσον ὃ κινεῖ κινούμενον. ἐν δὲ τοῖς ἐμψύχοις σώμασι δεῖ τι εἶναι σῶμα τοιοῦτον.*

σῶμα is a little suspicious in any case, but especially after *σώμασι*. Perhaps it is an inadvertent repetition of that word, usurping the place of *μόριον* (703 a 28) or *μέρος*, which would be more natural.

De An. Inc. 16. 713 b 20 *τρωγλοδυτεῖ τὰ μὲν τοῖς τόκοις, τὰ δὲ καὶ τῷ βίῳ παντί.*

τοῖς τόκοις may perhaps dispense with *ἐν*, but can *τῷ βίῳ παντί*? We might read *τὰ μὲν* < *ἐν* >, or *κἀν* for *καί*.

De Caelo 1. 1. 268 a 13 *τελευτὴ καὶ μέσον καὶ ἀρχὴ τὸν ἀριθμὸν ἔχει τὸν τοῦ παντός, ταῦτα δὲ τὸν τῆς τριάδος.*

ταῦτα should clearly be *ταὐτά* (so in *Physiogn.* 1. 805 a 24 correct *τοῦτο* to *ταὐτο*). Why does Aristotle indulge in the curious *ὕστερον πρότερον* of mentioning *τελευτή* first?

De Gen. et Corr. 2. 11. 337 b 7 *μέλλων γὰρ δή* (for *ἄν*).

De Gen. An. 2. 3. 736 b 29 *οὐθὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ* (i.e. *τοῦ νοῦ*) *τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ κοινωνεῖ σωματικὴ ἐνέργεια.*

After *ει* in *κοινωνεῖ* it is likely that the article *ἡ* has been lost.

ib. 2. 6. 742 a 25 *τὸ μὲν ὑπάρχειν δεῖ πρότερον, τὸ ποιητικόν, οἷον τὸ διδάξαν τοῦ μανθάνοντος.*

Certainly *τὸ διδάξον*. The aorist is quite wrong.

ib. 744 b 20 < *τοῖς* > *οἰκέταις*, as in the other two cases. *τοῖς* has been lost after *της* in *ταύτης*.

ib. 5. 1. 778 a 20 *τυγχάνει δὲ τῶν τοιούτων ἔνια μὲν ὅλοις ὑπάρχοντα τοῖς γένεσιν, ἐνίοις δ' ὅπως ἔτυχεν.*

ἐνίοις seems a mistake, due to the datives before it. Read *ἔνια*.

ib. 778 a 34 *οὐδὲ δή* for *οὔτε δέ*?

ib. 780 b 20 *κρίνει* should be *κρινεῖ* to match *ὄψεται*. Cf. on *Met.* 1010 a 37.

De Mirab. Ausc. 163. 846 b 9 read *ἐμπαθέστερον* for *συμπαθέστερον* and *ib.* 102. 839 a 19 *ἐπ' αὐτῇ* or *ἐπ' αὐτήν* for *ἐν αὐτῇ*.

H. RICHARDS.

THE SHORTER GLOSSES OF PLACIDUS.

This article contains things new and old, and cannot plead 'pars nova maior erit,' but only 'lector utrique fave.' The old, with more details and proofs, will be found in the preface to vol. v of the Corpus Glossariorum and in a dissertation by a pupil of Goetz, P. Karl: de Placidi glossis, Jena, 1906.

Placidus' Glossary has come down to us through three channels:

(*R*) the lost exemplar of some fifteenth century MSS. at Rome.

(*P*) an eleventh century MS. at Paris from Silos Abbey in North Spain. It is a composite Glossary, combining the Placidus Glossary with apparently other two. The first part (down to the middle of the F-section) is lost.

(*G*) a lost MS. from which the Placidus glosses in the Liber Glossarum were taken. Our earliest MSS. of the Liber Glossarum (the Lorsch transcript as well as the two in the Corbie ab-type) belong to the beginning of the ninth century. Apparently *G* was a composite Glossary of the exact pattern of *P*. Our three channels thus become two, since *P* and *G* turn out to be identical. *R* and *PG* come from the same archetype, for they share in many errors; and the order of the glosses in this archetype has been preserved by *R*, an alphabetical order, the first letter only being taken into account (A-, not AB-); e.g. *coculis* was immediately followed by *caespitibus*. Curiously enough, the MS. of Placidus' Glossary used by Isidore shared in an error of this archetype, a dittography of the syllables *a co* in the gloss *caltulum*:

> Caltulum cinguli genus a co
> a colore caltae dictum.

This ACOACO was naturally interpreted as *a coacto*, leaving *lore* to become *loro* (Isid. *Etym.* 19, 33, 4 with *G*) or *lare* (*R*). Whether Isidore's MS. of the Glossary had also the alphabetical arrangement we cannot tell. But some errors common to *RPG* shew us that this was not the original order; e.g. their archetype had in the I-section the gloss *caculabor* wrongly written *iaculabor*, a proof that the alphabetical arrangement was subsequent to this corruption of the text (cf. *hemdem* in the H-section?). It is therefore uncertain whether the (Latinized) Etruscan word for 'haruspicem,' corruptly presented in our MSS. (see Thes. Gloss. s.v. nartheterem), began with narth- or arth-. Even without this direct evidence we might guess that the repetition of the same gloss at a short interval (e.g. in the A-section *actutum* twice, *apludam* and *apluda*) could not have been tolerated by the author.

I say 'the author' and not 'Placidus' because these two glosses (and the others I have mentioned) belong to a portion (called by Goetz the 'glossae breviores') which has been added to the original work. The addition stands at the end of the A-section (Corp. Gloss. v 6, 4 Allaterati—8, 2 Amussis), at the beginning of the B-section (8, 5 Boni aequique—8, 24 Boni consultum), at the end of the C-section (13, 22 Crea—16, 6 Cabonum), at the beginning of the D-section (16, 7 Damium—16, 44 Dispuditum), and so on (21, 2 Exerimus—21, 32 Exhaustrantibus; 21, 34 Fautor—23, 4 Flatare; 24, 14 Genuinorum—24, 28 Galerum; 25, 12 Hilum—25, 30 Hirudo; 28, 21 Ingruit—29, 29 Impotens; 29, 35 Ludicro—30, 11 Lucuns; 33, 4 Manticulatio—33, 30 Manducum; 33, 31 Nautea—34, 7 Nullationem; 36, 17 Obstipiculus—37, 7 Offucas; 37, 9 Paedor—37, 31 Pedo. To these must be added a few omitted in *R*, e.g. *mentis* 84, 2). Someone had incorporated with Placidus' Glossary a second glossary of a quite different type. He stayed his hand after the P-section, through laziness, not through lack of materials. For the writer of the Preface to Book VII of the Salmasian Anthology, a preface which 'would have made Quintilian stare and gasp,' culled his weird words from this 'second glossary' and uses some which begin with later letters of the alphabet (e.g. *sonivius* in this astounding sentence: quis

enim me sonivium et non murgisonem fabula autumabit quam mentorem exfabillabit altiboans?). If we accept the usually accepted date and locality for the Anthology, we find this 'second glossary' in use in North Africa at the beginning of the sixth century.

This 'second glossary,' whether it was a second work of Placidus or by some other compiler (see Aul. Gell. 18, 7, 3 on the craze for 'glossaria et lexidia'), was compiled directly from the brief interlinear or marginal explanations written in the compiler's copies of certain Republican authors, e.g. Lucilius (whence *gallicolai*: cortice nucis inglandis viridis, per quem corpus humanum intellegi vult), Ennius (whence *mentis*: genitivum casum pro nominativo posuit; debuit enim dicere 'mens'), Naevius (whence *in flustris*: in portu), Livius Andronicus (whence *nefrendem*: infantem nondum dentatum qui frendere cibum non queat, id est frangere), and so on. If we had the glossary itself we should probably find that the order of the words was the order of their occurrence in the texts of the Republican writers. We should get the same clue as we get from Nonius Marcellus to the arrangement of the fragments of early literature. Still, as it is, we do get actual fragments of Republican writing, even though they are usually limited to single words and the name of the book and its author is usually unknown; and it is a pity that the Thesaurus (I mean the great Latin Dictionary, not Goetz' 'Thesaurus Glossarum') does not indicate these 'Placidi glossae breviores' by some recognizable mark. For example, the word *caelitus*, a formation with the Indoeuropean suffix tōs, 'from heaven,' ought to be an early Latin form; but the Thesaurus calls it 'vox inferioris aetatis,' because it does not happen to occur in any extant author of an earlier period. And yet its appearance among these 'glossae breviores' (caelitus: a caelo quomodo divinitus a deo) gives it much the same claim to antiquity as if Nonius had cited it in his Dictionary of Republican Latin. Perhaps a stronger claim; for while Virgil (antiquitatis amans) is quoted freely by Nonius, it may be doubted whether so late a writer is ever the source of these 'shorter glosses' (6, 10 adorea: farra, ut apud Virgilium, presumably comes from an occurrence of

adorea in an early author). Similarly *continari* 'to meet,' used by Apuleius and later authors, is claimed for Republican Latin by its appearance among the 'shorter glosses'; although in this case we have also a Sisenna quotation by Nonius. *Demusso* is a better example, for this verb (used by Apuleius, who revelled in archaic vocables) has no support from Nonius. In such cases it would be convenient if the Thesaurus would substitute 'Gloss. Plac. brev.' for 'Gloss. Plac.' The reader would then understand that the word in this actual form (e.g. *dispuditum* in the 'shorter gloss' dispuditum: puduit, rubori fuit) had been found by the compiler in some book of the Republican period.

The date of the compilation is unknown. The Salmasian Anthology gives us a 'terminus ante quem.' And we get a 'terminus post quem' from the glosses *ingluviem* (Cornutus ventrem, Plinius edacitatem), *magmentum* (alii pinguissimum extorum, alii secunda prosecta, Cornutus quicquid mactatur, id est quicquid distrahitur). The editor (or editors) of the Republican authors had used Cornutus' commentary on Virgil and the elder Pliny's 'libri Dubii Sermonis' in composing these two marginal notes. The 'ante quem' and 'post quem' limits leave a wide interval for choice, from the Archaic Revival down to the beginning of the sixth century. Heraeus' argument (in Berl. Phil. Woch. of 1908, p. 615) for the sixth century is not quite convincing, the use of *nam* in such a gloss as *colurnis* (ex cornu factis, nam et colurni qui ex corulo fiunt); and it remains to be seen whether any help can be got from glosses like *impulsas* (impositas, unde hodie quoque 'impulsari fascem' dicimus quod magis 'imponi' decentius dicitur. Like our 'clap on his shoulders' and 'place on his shoulders'). *Mu*, described as 'adhuc in consuetudine,' seems to have been an African interjection (cf. Plaut. *Caec.* frag. x; Class. Rev. 12, 364). A faint indication that Spain, the home of *P* (and probably of its cognate *G*), was also the home of the archetype of *R* is the Spanish *per-* symbol (pro *R*) in the gloss *Ambronem*.

Nonius compiled his dictionary from marginal notes of this type, as we learn from his express statement (541, 25 limbus, ut adnotatum invenimus, muliebre vestimentum): as well as from his use of two copies of Plautus (i.e. the marginal notes in

two copies), one of which contained only the first three plays (see the small Teubner edition of Nonius, p. xv). I have made (in Philologus 63, 273 sqq.) a tentative reconstruction of the marginal notes on Plautus which were worked up by Nonius into dictionary form. They are of much the same type as the 'shorter glosses.' With the note on Plaut. *Amph.* 245 (=Nonius 128) involant] inruunt, evolant, we may compare Plac. 28, 37 (conceivably from the same line of Plautus) involant: invadunt, arripiunt. They often shew wrong readings and wrong interpretations, as do the 'shorter glosses' (e.g. Plac. 7, 16 arse verse: proverbium; 22, 8 on *Faunii modi*); but hardly so appalling an example as that which Goetz ascribes to the latter in the gloss which he refers to an explanation of Plaut. *Pseud.* 16 me antidhac (presumably mis-written or mis-read 'meant idac'), *idac*: antehac. (This would however be a mistake of the compiler, not of the annotator: and, if Placidus was the compiler, it can stand beside his explanation of *meditullium* as 'in quo aliqua meditantur'!) And Nonius seems to have taken from the annotation of Plaut. *Asin.* 158 (quo magis te in altum capessis, aestus te in portum refert) a batch of glosses (Aestus] marini impetus vel commotiones. Lucr. IV 'frigus ut a fluviis, calor ab sole, aestus ab undis aequoris.' Capessis] immittis. Refert] revocat) which finds, I think, a parallel in that puzzling 'short gloss' *excetra* (Plac. 21, 11 Excetra: multiplex serpens. Rediviam [?]: redivivam. Quaen anne significat; if that is the right setting). From the 'alio loco' of the gloss *caespitibus* (14, 36 caespitibus: glebis terrae cum suo gramine, interdum alio loco ramis) we may perhaps infer that the author had used the word in two passages. Similarly from the gloss *cluram* (15, 44 cluram vel clurum: simiam alias cercopithecum), that the author used both the First and the Second Declension forms. With the inaccurate citations found by Nonius in marginalia (e.g. of Virgil *Georg.* 3, 143 in a note on a passage of Varro, ap. Non. 531, 22) may be compared the inaccurate Virgil citation s.v. *altiboans*.

These 'shorter glosses' leave plenty of room for conjectural emendation, since they all come ultimately from a MS. of Placidus' Glossary into which they had been pitchforked by a

lazy hand. Our archetype shews such marks of carelessness as the fusion of two lemmas into one (e.g. 24, 23 *gnarificationum* and *grallis*) and the omission (by the rubricator) of the initial letter of a lemma (e.g. 29, 6 *aculabor* for *caculabor*, miscopied *iaculabor*). In attempting to emend them, we should remember that, while all manner of mistakes attach themselves and cling like burrs to glossaries, the peculiar 'causae erroris' in this branch of transcription are:

(1) Fusion of neighbouring glosses (when the first gloss did not close before the end of a line, and the beginning of the next gloss was not clearly marked, e.g. by a large initial letter or by the 'paragraphus').

(2) Transposition (occasionally omission) of a clause (when the blank space at the end of a gloss was utilized for the 'overflow words' of a neighbouring line). The archetype had (in the true Placidus portion):

> Lupam meretricem a rapacitate vel a
> libidine huius animalis, unde et lupa
> Lepidula festiva. nar dicitur.

This led not to transposition, but to omission in *PG* (not in *R*), *unde et lupa lepidula festiva* (the 'overflow' being omitted).

(3) Capricious abbreviations (usually 'suspensions') e.g. of the lemma-word when repeated or of current words like 'dicitur,' 'significat,' etc. The letter *d* (with some form of abbreviation-stroke) may represent 'dicitur,' 'dicimus,' 'dixit' and other parts of the verb (e.g. 'dictum'). When the abbreviation-stroke traverses the letter, the symbol is indistinguishable from a *d* which had been written in error and obliterated. It might be omitted by a transcriber. The corresponding symbol of 'respondetur,' 'respondit,' 'responsum,' etc., viz. *r* with transverse stroke, originally denoted 'res' and, as a marginal symbol, denotes 'require' (-endum). Its earlier use may perhaps be found in the gloss *censio* (14, 46), where *res* has been omitted. In 22, 8 the variants perhaps point to celebrā (cf. my Notae Latinae, p. 416).

Transposition due to another practice (not peculiar to glossaries), the marginal supplement of an omitted clause, I

would find in the gloss *favisae* (22, 1). I take it that the page of the pro-archetype began with the lemma *forco*, the lemma which immediately follows *favisae*. The last clause ('a fruge danda') of the lemma *frugem fecisti* (22, 31) had been omitted at its proper place and supplied (by a corrector) in the top-margin of the page. It was preceded by some symbol for the common 'hoc minus est' (= hoc deest), either the usual hm or else hmn or the like. Hence the extraordinary ending of the lemma *favisae* in our MSS.: hominum a fruge danda.

A few random suggestions follow:

8, 17 bubum: senium, angorem. The *bubus* of Gram. Lat. I 75, 15 is more likely to be the bovus: *βουκόλιον* of ibid. I 551, 15.

14, 22 ciet: movet vel invocat. The famous uncial Glossary, Vat. lat. 3321 (written in Central Italy in the eighth century), offers another use of the word, 'challenges' (Corp. Gloss. IV 34, 33 movet caput, provocat. On *movet caput* see Hor. *Sat.* I, 5, 58).

14, 44 colore: corpore vel cute. If this comes from Plaut. *Rud.* 997, our MSS. of Plautus may be right in assigning the opening words of the line to Trachalio. He asks *quo colore est?* 'what sort of fish is it?', and Gripus, in replying, wilfully misunderstands this colloquial use of *color*.

15, 31 conspiceor (-cio *R*): uideor (-deo *R*). Read *conspicor*: videor ('am seen'). For the passive use of *conspicor* in early Latin see the Thesaurus. Cf. *despicor* Pass. in Plaut. *Cas.* 189 and, I would add, 185.

15, 45 cassiculo (Dat. or Abl.), presumably Masc. The evidence of Paul. Fest. 41, 19 is too weak to support a Neuter form 'cassiculum.' Festus may have confined his remarks to *cassiculo*.

16, 2 caltulum. If the gloss comes from Plaut. *Epid.* 231, it confirms the reading of the MSS. (*F n. l.*) of Varro *L.L.* 5, 131; whereas editors of Plautus print *caltulam*.

16, 27 Ritschl's unhappy attempt to efface the alliteration in Plaut. *Trin.* 652 should be ignored in the Thes. Gloss.

16, 34 derupsit (dir-?): dispersit. Rather *disperserit* (cf. *accepso* for 'accepero,' etc.).

21, 6 Has *R* omitted (cf. 64, 12) eliminat: procedit (see Skutsch in Glotta 3, 387)?

21, 9 eritum: domin⟨i⟩um may be right. With eritus, -us compare famulatus, -us; with eritio, famulatio, and so on (cf. Non. 109 famulitas, 206 famulatus and famulatio).

21, 7 egretus (egregius MSS.): erectus, evigil? Paul. Fest. 6 (s.v. adgretus) suggests derivation from *ἐγείρομαι*.

22, 2 Have two glosses been fused, *forco* and ⟨*forpex*⟩ dicta ab eo quod feriendo petat?

24, 15 It seems necessary to mention that *gutturnio* (-neo) is not Nom. but Dat. or Abl.

24, 20 gramîs (i.e. gramiis) is not impossible (cf. Ennius' nonis Iunîs 'on the Nones of June,' a form overlooked by Skutsch when he denied the possibility of Plautus scanning e.g. *gratiis* as a spondee). Cf. the gloss antîs.

25, 12 sqq. These 'shorter glosses' in the H-section have a curious suggestion of Plautus now and then. Thus *habeo* (habito...'qui hic habet' pro habitat) suits the opening Scene of the Curculio, *v.* 32 quin leno hic habitat, *v.* 44 nempe huic lenoni qui hic habet (almost required by the rhythm). And *herbidis* (ab herbae colore, id est luridis) may offer a variant for the 'Palatine' edition's reading in *v.* 231 of the same play: cum conlativo ventre atque oculis herbeis. (By the way, the gloss *collativus*: magnus, e conlatione factus, illustrated by Goetz from Paul. Fest. 51, 15, is at least as closely related to Paul. Fest. 33, 23 *conlativum sacrificium*: quod ex conlatione offertur. It was because a 'joint' sacrifice, etc., was larger than the usual that Plautus, and possibly Plautus alone, facetiously applied the adjective to another unusually large object). But it is probably a mere accident that the gloss *hiras*, if changed to 'hirae,' could be associated with Curc. 238 (hirae omnes dolent), and a mere coincidence that, while *hostita* occurs in this part of the Glossary, Festus (s.v. status dies) cites Curc. 5 (si status condictus cum hoste intercedit dies), with the remark 'hostire ponebatur pro aequare.'

28, 34 iuvencam: iuvenem puellam. Some Republican writer had anticipated Horace (*C.* 2, 5, 6).

33, 24 minia: coturnicis (cotum aciae *codd.*) vox (cf. minurio,

μινύρομαι) is a possible (I cannot say 'probable') solution. It is not excluded by Paul. Fest. 33 (coturnix appellatur a sono vocis), since the quail has two notes.

36, 22 oppido: oppidi (quem MSS.) ad modum, sed nunc (i.e. in this passage) valde, if the repeated lemma-word was curtailed to õi or the like, which was miscopied 'quem.' But the *antigerio* gloss offers a difficulty.

37, 7 offucas: offers vel in fraudem das. This is intelligible as it stands; i.e. *offucas* has two meanings: (1) *offers*, in such a phrase as *offucare aquam* (Paul. Fest. 211 'in fauces obsorbendam dare'), (2) *in fraudem das*, when derived not from *fauces* but from *fucus* (cf. Paul. Fest. ibid. offucias: fallacias).

68, 9 (one of the 'shorter glosses'?) fac(i)e: faciam, ut ⟨dice⟩ dicam (cf. 16, 23 dice: dicam). It used to be a moot point whether these forms should be written with -ae (and regarded as a mere phonetic spelling of *faciam* and *dicam*) or with -e (an obsolete formation of 1 Sing. Fut. Ind. which has left trace of itself in the other Persons, -es, -et, -emus, -etis, -ent). Comparative Philologists now accept the second view. A remark of Quintilian (1, 7, 23) gives them support. He says that Cato's use of these forms is stated (positum) in Messala's book 'de S Littera.' This suggests that Messala mentioned them as a parallel to byforms like *amare* (*-ris*), *fortasse* (*-sis*), *mage* (*-gis*), etc. If so, they must surely have ended in *e*, not *ae*.

Let me take this opportunity of making two more guesses at the explanation of the gloss *egones* (not one of the shorter glosses of Placidus). We might change 'egones: sacerdotes rustici' into 'egones: sacerdotes Etrusci.' A mysterious word *een* appears now and then in the Agram Mummy 'liber linteus.' (Heraeus has already compared the *ergenna* of Persius 2, 26). Or we may retain the traditional reading and connect the gloss with the famous parody of Virgil *Ecl.* 3 init.: Dic mihi, Damoeta, 'cuium pecus' anne Latinum? Non, verum *Aegones* nostri sic rure loquuntur. Possibly some Christian Apologist referred to Pagan country-priests as *Aegones* (*Eg-*) 'of the Farmer Hodge type.'

It will be noticed that in this article Karl's division of the 'shorter glosses' into two portions (of separate origin) has been

ignored. It does not seem a true κατ' εἴδη διαίρεσις. The twofold division of the real Placidus glosses (into 1. hints on 'bona locutio' and orthography, 2. explanations of words or phrases in books) is more convincing, but need not imply that these represent a combination of two separate glossaries, if the following conjectural account of Placidus be true. I take it that 'Placidus grammaticus' lectured in some provincial (African?) town where his pupils knew little Latin (witness the elementary information imparted in a great number of the glosses) and no Greek (witness such glosses as *echo* 'graecum nomen est'). He was a Christian and a poor Latinist (e.g. referring apparently to Joh. 1, 14, he says 'effectus est carnem' is a permissible construction, though not so good as 'effectus est caro'!). Like a good Christian he hated the Jews of his town and, in correcting an error of Jewish Latin *lamentus* (facere, like 'fletus facere') for *lamenta* (presumably used by the Jews in speaking of their custom on the ninth day of Ab), he rates the nation in the Rialto style: 'lamenta' dicimus genere neutro, numero semper plurali; 'lamentus' autem genere masculino dicunt Iudaei et eorum filii, cimices non lecti genialis sed sandapilae amphitheatralis. A 'gloss' like this is clearly a note from a lecture by Placidus on 'bona locutio.' And the glosses on passages in books may quite well be notes from his lectures on books: e.g. Heliton heros apud Latinos nullus est; quaerendusne in Graecis aut Persis? (a note on a passage in which Helicon, brother of Cithaeron, was mentioned. The 'aut Persis' is curious). *Heliton* here need not be the error of a mediaeval scribe. The corrupt reading may have been found in the edition lectured on by Placidus, like the corrupt reading *sensa* in a copy of Donatus' commentary on Virgil(?) from which comes a gloss (apparently not by Placidus) sensa: nota pro 'sensus' corporis 'sensa' dici; Donatus grammaticus ait 'Epicurus ostendit omnia conprehendi posse sensa corporis' (Corp. Gloss. v 149, 2). Possibly the same work of Donatus contained the phrase (a scribe's error?) *regionem intra degit*, for the Ars Major of Donatus (391, 18 K.) is referred to in Placidus' note: poetico more fecit; nam si volumus rectius loqui, 'in regione degit' aut 'intra regionem'

dicimus; et postposuit praepositionem et perdidit vim suam, ut in Arte legimus. One of the authors lectured on was Virgil, for the phrase *in burim* (Georg. 1, 169) is the subject of a note. The others have not been identified. A Christian author is betrayed by such a phrase as *in aeternae vitae crepidine fundatus*, while the 'tumidus Aforum sermo' is reflected in *numeros omnimodos pulsas tuo plectro* and the like. A dactylic hexameter poem is suggested by *iuvenale phaos*; perhaps Iambic Scazon by the description of a beggar, *aere vitam ducit ac manu*.

The pupil who had taken these desultory notes of Placidus' lectures arranged them alphabetically (by A-, not AB-) and published them as a Glossary. This flimsy production seems to have enjoyed undeserved popularity. It passed (from Africa?) into Spain, where Isidore made much use of it in his Etymologiae. He cites Placidus by name in his Differentiae. The 'second glossary' likewise passed from Africa into Spain, where its *caltulum* lemma was borrowed, as we have seen, by Isidore. But I prefer to regard it as a quite different book from the paltry Placidus glossary (in which all that is valuable is the mere traditional stock-in-trade of the Grammatici). I am unwilling to allow any connexion of the 'shorter glosses' with such Dogberries as Placidus and Placidus' pupil. The preserver of these precious relics of the older Republican literature claims a far higher place; he is worthy of mention beside Nonius Marcellus. Some owner, I take it, of the paltry glossary ('glossae acceptae ex auditorio Placidi grammatici' would be the true title) conceived the idea of adding their gold to the dross of Placidus. As we have seen, he stayed his hand after entering the glosses from A- to P-, being weary of the task of alphabetical selection. If the 'second glossary' had been (like the other) arranged alphabetically, he might have preserved for us the whole of it. That it was not so arranged we see from such glosses (already mentioned) as *caculabor* and *excetra*.

At what time and in what country the Placidus Glossary was enlarged and enriched by the addition of the 'second glossary' we cannot tell. Isidore used both, but, while it is likely, it is not demonstrable that he found the two combined in a single volume. The last word however on the whole

Placidus problem will be spoken by Goetz in vol. I of the Corpus Glossariorum, when that long-looked-for volume appears. In his article 'Glossographie' in the Pauly-Wissowa Encyclopaedia he does not commit himself to any theory. If he accepts the theory offered here, I hope he will substitute for 'glossae breviores Placidi' the more convenient title 'the pseudo-Placidus glossary'. Of course Deuerling's account (not to mention Ritschl's) is, to a great extent, antiquated now that the Corpus has provided the full material in accurate form.

W. M. LINDSAY.

THE 'ABOLITA' GLOSSARY (VAT. LAT. 3321).

One of the most famous MSS. with Latin glossaries is an uncial Vatican MS. which is labelled 'Vat. lat. 3321,' but which I shall call, for shortness, 'Vat.' It is a conglomerate of erudition suitable for monastery-students and has on the first leaf a picture of a monastery-teacher. On foll. 2–163 is a composite glossary printed by Goetz in vol. IV (pp. 3–198) of the Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum. (It is followed by Eucherius Instr. II.) The compiler used as ground-work the well known 'Abstrusa' Glossary (I use the symbol 'Abstr.'), so called because its first gloss is Abstrusa: abscondita. He added to it the contents of another, of which no separate copies are extant. The addition, which is about as large as the Abstrusa groundform, is kept separate in Goetz' apograph by being enclosed in square brackets. These non-Abstrusa portions I shall indicate by the symbol 'Abol.', since their first gloss in the Vatican MS. is Abolita: abstersa vel deleta.

It is convenient to speak of the two component parts as the 'Abstrusa' Glossary and the 'Abolita' Glossary, even though critics may question the claim of the latter to the name. In some glossary-fragments at Munich mentioned by Goetz on p. xiii of his preface are relics of a still wider combination than in Vat. Its compiler used not merely Abstr. and Abol. (or extracts from them) but many other glossaries (or lists), and indicated each source by a capital letter in the margin. The Abstr. portions he indicated by the letter V, the Abol. portions by L. From the very scanty details given by Goetz it seems as if the batch of Terence glosses on p. 193 of vol. IV (Vitio dent, from Andr. 8; Viso, from Andr. 535, etc.) may conceivably have been a later accretion. For the gloss Virops (no. 36 on p. 193)

is immediately followed by a gloss which may be based on Festus, the gloss Vitiligo (193, 40): macula alba in corpore: *ἀλφόν* Graeci et *ψώραν* vocant (cf. Paul. Fest. 507, Vitiligo in corpore hominis macula alba quam Graeci *ἀλφόν* vocant...Lucilius: Haec odiosa mihi vitiligo est. Num dolet? inquit). It is the presence of several more or less certain Festus glosses in the Abolita Glossary which necessitates this enquiry into its history.

Vat. (which contains Isidore's Differentiae) was absurdly assigned by Mai to the 6th century. Goetz and his friend Gustav Loewe preferred the 7th, but the most recent judgments (by Liebaert and Loew) declare for the 8th. In Class. Quart. 10, 115 reason is given for believing it to have been written in Central Italy.

If Italian uncial is hard to date, South Italian minuscule can now be dated with precision, thanks to Dr Loew; so we may refer to the 10th century another representative of this compound glossary, a Monte Cassino MS. (no. 439), which I shall call 'Cass.' (cf. Loew 'Beneventan Script,' p. 350).

A palaeographer can have no doubt about the archetype's home. It was Spain. That is proved firstly by such spellings as:

f for *v*, e.g. 16, 25 deforatores (Abol.); 42, 29 deforat (Abol.); 124, 17 (Abstr.); 149, 47 (Abstr.). Similarly *v* for *f* very often. We seem to have a Spaniard's spelling of *profanum* in 151, 14 (from Festus 256, 6 = Plaut. fr. inc. 38) Provanum habes: parvi penditur. And if the first transcription of 50, 28 in Vat., *devotionem*, is more correct than *defectionem*, we may suppose that *despondeo* had in the annotated passage (hic) the sense of *devoveo* (inscribo in tabula devotionis). This gloss, Despondit: hic in devotionem dedit, would then confirm 50, 30 Desponsi: steriles.

nicil and *mici* at 125, 17 (Abstr.), 177, 47 (Abol.);

perhaps also *au* for *ab*, e.g. 11, 32 (Abstr.), 151, 23 (Abol.).

So read 121, 38 Mut[il]at placitum: violat, abiurat (aut iurat MSS.).

Secondly by the occasional survival of the Spanish abbreviation-symbols, ihrslm̄ 'Iherusalem' 117, 2ª (Abol.), if this gloss comes from the archetype, and the 'per'-symbol at 15, 3 aliquan-

tisper (Abstr.) and 72, 21 semper (Abstr.). An Italian transcriber would take the Spanish 'per'-symbol for 'pro': and we find *pro* for *per* at 29, 48 (Abol.), 132, 5 (Abol.), etc. In 139, 8 (Abol., not Abstr.) Peicrat : ⟨per⟩iurat is probably the result of Peicrat pro iurat, just as the Virgil gloss (or rather scrap of Virgil) Muscos fontes seems due to Muscos i. ('id est') fontes. The abbreviation-stroke over *flagra* at 183, 6 (Abol.) makes one think of the peculiarly Spanish abbreviation of the word *flagellum*, an abbreviation which would puzzle any Italian scribe. The gloss (from Festus?) may have been Taenias : vittae sacerdotum, apud Praenestinos flagella (i.e. at Praeneste the word bore the sense of *flagella*).

Thirdly by the very frequent substitution of *a* for *t*; since an Italian scribe would find Spanish minuscule *t* difficult to distinguish from Italian *a*. A few examples are : 82, 12 (Abstr.) gestia (for -tit) ; 82, 29 (Abstr.) geria (for -rit) ; 83, 12 (Abstr.) gliscia (for -cit). We should read 115, 20 Memor: eo quod manet in mente[m] (maneam mentem Vat.). In its more cursive form Spanish *t* resembles *o*; and we find *o* for *t* here and there in the compound glossary but not nearly so often as *a* for *t*.

Both constituents (Abstr. and Abol.) were therefore transcribed in an Italian scriptorium from a (minuscule) MS. which had been brought to Italy from Spain. Whether they arrived as two separate glossaries, or (as seems more natural) the compound glossary had already been compiled in Spain, is an open question. There are faint indications that the common original of Vat. and Cass. was written by an Italian : the un-Spanish n̄ 'non' at e.g. 91, 49 (Abol.) and ē 'est' at e.g. 30, 30 (Abol.) 73, 12 (Abstr.)[1] ; but only faint. So much however is clear, that the alphabetical arrangement in Abol. had not been carried so far as in Abstr. The Abstrusa Glossary (by ABC-) regards the three opening letters of the word, the Abolita Glossary (by AB-) the first two only. Early scribes did not always recognise a

[1] That the Virgil glossary printed by Goetz in his vol. IV (pp. 427 sqq.) shews the same Fasem for Fas est is a curious coincidence, but nothing more. Even the Virgil glosses in Abol. are not so closely connected with the Virgil Glossary as all that.

difference between a beginning like *fa-* and one like *fla-*, between *po-* and *pro-*, etc.; and so we detect from errors in transcription not merely that Comitas followed immediately Comisatio in the Abol. archetype, but also that Postumus came directly after Proculus. (Or is 148, 2 a compound gloss ?)

The grafting of an AB- order upon an ABC- order must have played mischief with accuracy[1]. We cannot expect to get in Vat. or Cass. a correct presentation of the Abolita Glossary; especially in the longer sections such as the SU-section, in which four separate Abol. portions (of 32, 32, 18 and 28 glosses) are inserted (the Abstr. section being thus broken up into four portions of 27, 23, 26 and 14 glosses). Sometimes it seems as if the end of a page (column, leaf) was in these longer sections deemed a suitable place for the interposition of a portion of Abol.; for any less mechanical procedure would hardly have sandwiched the Abol. glosses 166, 20–42 between two so closely related Abstr. glosses as Sambucistria and Sambucinarius: ipse qui dicit (i.e. sings to her music). Similarly two Abol. glosses from the same line of Virgil (Aen. 1, 475) are separated by an Abstr. portion (36, 45–37, 14). If the same thing has happened in a Terence-batch, we should read at 162, 45 Resipisce (not Repeda). When a section begins with an Abol. (instead of Abstr.) portion, we may suppose that the preceding section had not reached to the end of the page (column) in the MS. of the Abolita Glossary. We may find too a clue to the pagination of the (or rather an) archetype of the compound glossary in corrections which we may suppose to have been entries in the upper or lower margin of a page, and to have been erroneously transcribed as separate glosses where they stood. To give two examples out of many: 112, 17 seems a (lower margin) correction of 112, 3–4; 172, 8 is a similar correction of 171, 46; and the riddle of 68, 33, Ex hoc: [magnifica vel a] modo, is solved if *magnifica, bella* was in the Abolita Glossary the corrected form (lower margin) of the interpretation-half of 67,

[1] In the PO-section, when we find that an Abstr. portion which ends POR- (at the gloss Portenta, 146, 28) is immediately followed by some Abol. glosses beginning with these three letters, we suspect that these glosses have been shifted to this Abol. portion.

22 (or 68, 20[a]) Eximia: magnifica. But these detections of the pagination of an archetype throw little light on the history of our text's transmission unless we can specify the archetype to which they refer. They help rather as examples of intrusion and displacement of glosses. An Abstr. gloss may have in this way wandered into an Abol. portion.

On the other hand it is important to notice that some Abol. glosses have not been enclosed in square brackets by Goetz. For examples we may select three which might put in a claim to be Festus glosses: 143, 16 Pipatio (the bracket should be shifted from no. 19 to no. 16; while no. 18, an intruder from no. 34[a], is an Abstr. gloss which may come from the same paragraph of a Grammar as supplied 145, 26: cf. 77, 23 and the Abavus gloss 343, 43): 144, 37 Planeus: 158, 26 Quique. Also 195, 31 Volutabra, etc. To judge from Goetz' apparatus, all these, and many others, are Abol. (not Abstr.) glosses.

Glossary-compilers and glossary-transcribers seize every opportunity of adding to their stock by what may be dignified with the name of cross-references. When a correction was written beside a gloss, both forms (the corrected and the uncorrected) were pressed into service by the next transcriber. The faulty Devulgat: notum facit was corrected at some time or other by the superscription of *divulgat*. This was transcribed thus:

Divulgat: notum facit.
Devulgat: quod supra.

Finally the lower gloss was whisked off to the DE- section, so that we find at 52, 39 (Abol.) Devulgat: quod supra, and four pages later (56, 28 Abstr.) Divulgat: notum facit. The 'quod supra' reveals the origin of the doublet in this case, and shews us that an Abstr. gloss has strayed into the Abol. portion.

This phrase 'quod (qui, quae) supra' (our 'ditto') was in the archetype often written q$\bar{s}$ (our 'd^{o}'), a symbol sometimes retained in our MSS., sometimes expanded. It is wrongly expanded ('quae supra') in Vat. at 140, 28 Pervagatur: quod supra, a reference to 140, 26 Pererrat: perambulat vel peragrat. It would be hypercritical to insist that the intervening gloss

(140, 27) must be a later insertion. But the phrase often reveals a disturbance of the original order, and the symbol has often puzzled transcribers. One who mistook it for 'quaestio' (or 'quae sunt'?) has substituted qst as a more familiar form for his readers (see Goetz' Thesaurus Glossarum, s.v. Factionarius, where this is wrongly explained as 'qui praeest'). The gloss Parma: genus scuti (137, 29) was followed by a synonym Parmula: quae (quod) supra (137, 31), but this Parmula was wrongly transcribed 'Parimula.' The correction Parmula has wandered as a separate gloss (like the wrong form Devulgat) to 136, 29, while the wrong form Parimula retains the true place of the gloss (so correct Thes. Gloss. s.v. Parimula).

Other abbreviation-symbols of the archetype that deserve mention are the pair current in all glossaries, ā 'aut' and ū 'vel.' Though they are found throughout Vat., they have often produced errors: e.g. 23, 16 (corrected at 23, 24) and 60, 22 (*a* for *aut*); 51, 6 (*an* for *aut*); 85, 21 (*aut* for *am*); 64, 35 (*um* for *vel*); 79, 57 (*vel* for *um*). Perhaps we should read 132, 18 Olympum: caelum, immane (miswritten ūmane). The capricious suspension posͣ 'positus' (128, 38) was transferred as it stood to Cass., but has been wrongly expanded to *post* in Vat. (cf. negͣ 'negotii' 82, 27). I find trace of the initial-letter suspension, so frequent in quotations, in 99, 14, if the initial form was Intrio: infundo, ut (?) 'tute h(oc) i(ntristi)'; also in the repeated word at 29, 34 Caperratum supercilium: triste s(upercilium).

So much for the history of the transmission. The history of the compilation of the Abolita Glossary is far more difficult and, if the alphabetical arrangement had been carried as far as in the Abstrusa Glossary, would be impossible. On this point a word or two is necessary. We have seen that Abstr. is arranged by ABC-, Abol. by AB- only. But in reality every glossary exhibits a movement towards more and more precision of alphabetical arrangement. In another MS. with our compound glossary (only a part, I to P, etc.) we find the two constituents amalgamated into one alphabetically arranged lexicon (by ABC-). This MS., Vat. lat. 6018, written, I think, in the beginning of the 9th century in North Italy (or Switzerland?), represents a later stage than Cass., whose arrangement

agrees more with Vat. (where Cass. differs from Vat.'s order we are not informed by Goetz' apparatus). We are fortunate in having so early a representative of the text as Vat. But even in Vat. there is movement in the usual direction, and the division-line between the ABC- arrangement of Abstr. and the AB- arrangement of Abol. is not maintained throughout. Thus Abstr. does not adapt itself to ABC- till the DEF- words are reached (unless we except the CON- group), and elsewhere occasionally (e.g. in the OR- and PL- sections) remains at the AB- stage; while, on the other hand, it reaches sometimes (as in the PRO- section) the ABCD- stage. Abol. sometimes attains the ABC- stage. An example is the TR- section, where Vat. actually offers the heading 'De T et R et A,' although the arrangement breaks down here and there; e.g. the TRI- section shews (186, 41) Treumite: semitae, followed by its cognate and better spelt gloss Tramites: viae transversae, then by an apparent Festus gloss Transennam dicit tegulas per quas lumen admittitur Luc(ilius), a transeundo appell(atam). We may guess that Tramites was attracted to this part by Treumite, and took along with it the neighbouring Festus gloss. These few details may suffice to remind us that even in Vat. we find the Abolita Glossary in a form so appreciably removed from the original order and contents, that the lines of the frame-work are no longer clearly discernible.

One portion, the Virgil glosses (not discerned by Funck in Commentationes Woelfflinianae), is however so patent as to suggest a later accretion. In most sections we find unmistakeable batches of these, arranged usually in the order of their occurrence, and so can restore with confidence a number of corrupt glosses to their original form: e.g. 52, 50-51 Decolor aetas: non similis, desidia debilitata (Aen. 8, 326); 169, 51 Set res animos incognita t(urbat), an actual scrap of Virgil (Aen. 1, 515). Conjectures like Aeres animos: incitatos (Journ. Phil. 20, 57) are thus sent to limbo, the limbo that ever threatens any unmethodical or 'feet-on-the-hob' emendation. Here and there an error of transcription reveals the earliest arrangement of these Virgilian 'glossae collectae,' by A-, not AB-. Thus 152, 12, Prima peto ⟨: primum locum, Perculit:⟩ percussum deiecit,

shews the gloss Prima peto (Aen. 5, 194) immediately preceding the gloss Perculit (Aen. 5, 372). Similarly, if 126, 13 is really Non ⟨ullo⟩: nullo, Nec posse: nec valere, we find Non ullo (Georg. 1, 22) immediately preceding Nec posse (Aen. 1, 38). Indeed if we could believe the compilation of the IN- section to be typical of the whole, we could not hesitate to call these Virgil glosses a later accretion. For they stand at the end of the section, and retain the AB- arrangement, whereas the preceding Abol. portions have, we may say, advanced to the ABC- order. But a wider survey convinces us that this feature of the IN- section is not a feature of each and every section. In the SI- section the Virgil-batch comes early; in the TR- section there is more than one batch, conforming to the ABC- arrangement, e.g. a TRA- batch at 186, 10 sqq., a TRO- batch at 187, 5 sqq. The Spanish spelling of *mihi* appears in a Virgil gloss (177, 47) Sunt mici: habeo. We are driven to the conclusion that the Virgil glosses stand on the same footing as the other constituents of the Abolita Glossary. It is their large number that gives them their prominence and their fairly well preserved coherence.

The Terence glosses (investigated by Gnueg 'de glossis Terentianis cod. Vaticani, 3321,' Jena, 1903) are not nearly so numerous, and therefore Terence-batches are not so prominent as Virgil-batches. Still they are fairly prominent in many of the sections and in some manage to retain fairly well the order of occurrence in the plays, so that conjectural emendation passes from conjecture to certainty. Thus we can refer to Hec. 629 (dic filiae rus concessuram hinc Sostratam) the gloss (43, 19) Concessurum: migraturum (*leg.* -turam?), and get a hint of a MS. of Terence which preserved in this line the old indeclinable Fut. Inf. It is unlucky that the Terence Glossary printed by Goetz in vol. v (pp. 529 sqq.) is drawn from only Andr., Adel., Eun. (in this order); for it reveals to us a MS. which had at Andr. 814 the true reading *grandicula* (see Thes. Gloss. s.v. and Kauer in Burs. Jahresb. 143, 183). It retains the primitive alphabetical arrangement (by A-, not AB-) and presents the glosses in each section in the order of their occurrence. Here and there an error of transcription reveals to us the earliest stage of all, the unsorted 'glossae collectae'; e.g. Callide (Adel.

417) was immediately followed by (I)stace (Adel. 418), Flos ipse (Eun. 319) by Vi (Eun. 319). To return to the Abolita Glossary, if the Virgil glosses of Abol. need not be regarded as later accretions, much less need the Terence glosses. Allowing 132, 5 Offirmare to be a Terence gloss (from Eun. 217), we find a Spanish symptom in the Terence portion of Abol., for Vat. offers *produrare* instead of *perdurare*.

Loewe (Prodr. p. 144) affirms the presence of a number of Apuleius glosses. I find them (e.g. Agasone 13, 37?) hard to detect (in the absence of an Apuleius Lexicon). An example of a possible Apuleius-batch in the CA- section is 29, 33–35: Crapula (Met. 8, 13?), Caperratum (Met. 9, 16?), Carchesium (Met. 11, 16?); another in the CI- section: Caeruleus (Met. 2, 9?), Circumforaneis (Met. 3, 2), Citimum (Socr. 8?), Circumlocutiones (Apol. 33?); another in the CO- section: Commodum (e.g. Met. 1, 24), Continantur (e.g. Met. 1, 24; 5, 31), Concipulassent (Met. 9, 2?), Comitialis morbus (Apol. 50?), Copia (e.g. Apol. 20), Confertos (Flor. 17) etc. These three examples at least reveal the danger in claiming for Festus each and every Early Latin gloss in Abol. It may be a Terence gloss; it may be an Apuleius gloss (possibly from a lost work of Apuleius), etc. Thus Vitiligo (mentioned at the beginning of this article) might be referred to Apol. 50; Aquariolus (if that is the true form of 135, 7, a gloss which one is tempted to complete by the *vel optio* of 128, 18) to Apol. 78. But Appendix: socia, comes, which has been referred to Met. 5, 24, is really an intruder from the Abstrusa Glossary (10, 35).

The Festus glosses, to come at last to the real subject of this article, are also hard to detect. There have been so many false claimants that we are justly sceptical; the gloss Scrupea, for example (see Thes. Gloss. s.v.). I find it more likely that a marginal note on Aen. 6, 238 produced two Virgil glosses, Scrupea: saxa nigra, Scopuli: saxa grandia, just as the note on Aen. 2, 23 seems to have been Carinae: medium navium. Rostra: pectora navium. The most convincing claimant is 123, 45 which appeared in the archetype as two glosses:

> Nequinunt pro nequeunt ut solent.
> Nequiunt greciam redire,

a corrupt version of a redaction of Festus p. 160 Nequinont pro nequeunt, ut solinunt, ferinunt pro solent et feriunt, dicebant antiqui. Livius in Odissia 'partim errant, nequinunt Graeciam redire.' (Paulus' Epitome reduces all this to a couple of words, Nequinont: nequeunt.) The long gloss (precisely how long it was is uncertain) has been broken into two; and since the two luckily begin with the same pair of letters, it has not suffered the fate of another gloss (from Festus[1]?) not so long, whose second part has been whisked off from the AU- section to the AB- section at 4, 25, viz. 23, 11 Ausonia Italia dicta | ab Ausonio Ulyxis et Calypsus filio (cf. Thes. Gloss. s.v. Tartarus for another long gloss similarly treated). The corruption of the gloss Nequinunt we may refer to a very natural leap of the transcriber's eye from *solinunt* to *solent*: Nequinunt pro nequeunt, ut ⟨solinunt pro⟩ solent; 'nequinunt Graeciam redire.'

From this (we may say) indubitable example we may infer that the Festus glosses of Abol. did not come from marginalia like the Nonius Glossary printed by Goetz in vol. v (pp. 637 sqq.). Nor can we believe the gloss Nequinunt to have been a scholium on another author. For what passage of what author could information of this sort be required? Now that Anspach's discovery (see Class. Quart. 10, 110) has revealed to us the use by Italian ecclesiastics of a text of Festus as a quarry for scholia, our first impulse is to regard the Festus glosses as a later accretion to Abol., added when Abol. reached Italy. That is certainly the most natural explanation of the small group (printed by Goetz on p. xviii of the preface to vol. IV) which has intruded into an Italian MS. of the Asbestos Glossary, Vat. lat. 1469 written in 908 (in, I think, Central Italy); not the Monte Cassino MS. (no. 218) written in 909. It is too suitable an explanation to be overcome by the argument (Rhein. Mus. 40, 35) that two of the Lucilius citations specify the book from which they are taken ('Lucilius in XXII,' 'Lucilius in II Satirarum'), while Festus normally does not (but cf. Fest. 180 Noctipugam ...Lucilius lib. II). But I see no reason for believing the Festus

[1] If it is, then its neighbour may be also; if we read Aplustrum: amplificatum (cf. Paul. 9 quia erant amplius quam essent necessaria usu). But Augustum is a plausible reading.

glosses of Abol. to stand on a different footing from the Virgil or Terence or Apuleius glosses. From the Spanish symptoms *pro* for *per* and *v* for *f* (unless the verb was *rehebantur*) we can infer that the gloss Carracutium (29, 48) came to Italy from Spain. But we cannot (with our present knowledge) be sure that it is a Festus gloss. Its neighbour Capronae (29, 49) we might claim for Festus (rather than Apuleius Flor. 3 promulsis caproneis) if its original form was Capronae ⟨ut Lucilius 'fluitare capronas'⟩: hic medios inter tempora capillos. Proprie vero equorum iubae, etc. Certainly the word *hic* 'in this passage' suggests that the line of Lucilius (288 Ma.) which contains the word in the accusative case (the case of *capillos*) and with this unusual meaning had preceded.

As regards Festus-batches the order in Festus, or at least in Paulus' Epitome (not quite the same thing), supports the claim, e.g. in the AG- section of Aegrum: ⟨*ἀ*⟩*νεχρόν* (Paul. 6), Agonia and Agina (Paul. 9), Ammenta (Paul. 11) (but the first may be Atrum: nigrum); in the CE- section of Creperis (Paul. 46), Creterrae (Paul. 46, later than Creperum), Cernuus (Paul. 48); in the OB- section of Obbrutuit (Paul. 201),... Obstipum (Paul. 210),... Obmoveto pro moveto (prom.?) ⟨a⟩d ant⟨e⟩ (Paul. 222); in the OF- section of Offucias (Paul. 211), Offendix (Paul. 223), a couple which becomes a trio if we include Offivebant: claudebant seris (but see Thes. Gloss. s.v. officio). Landgraf (Arch. Lat. Lexicogr. 9, 170) wrongly uses this Offendix gloss in a Monte Cassino MS. (no. 90) of the 11th (not 10th) century as proof that the glossary in this MS. draws from Festus and not merely from Paulus' Epitome; for the gloss has clearly been borrowed from the Abolita Glossary.

But if the long Virgil and Terence groups were liable to have their arrangement disturbed, much more the smaller Festus groups. If a mere two or three glosses were contributed to an Abol. section, they would be apt to attach themselves to glosses of similar form or meaning. Thus the gloss Nequinunt seems to owe its position at 123, 45 to the presence of a gloss Nequeo at 123, 44. We can claim 19, 27, Apagete: aperite, for an (apparently) isolated Terence gloss: it is so peculiarly appropriate to a wrong-headed marginal note on the *apage te* of Eun.

904 (spoken 'ante ostium,' v. 895). We can equally claim as a Festus gloss 115, 19, Metalli dicuntur in legem, for this fragment can be restored to its original form (or something like it) with the help of Festus 132. The gloss was originally:

Metalli dicuntur in lege mi
litari mercennarii

(cf. 36, 22); and any Glossary which provides an item like, let us say, Litterarii: mercennarii may claim affinity with Abol. Another fragmentary Festus gloss has been found in 121, 4 Muscerdas dicebant antiqui (from Fest. 132 Muscerdas prima syllaba producta dicebant antiqui stercus murum). But it is conceivable that what the compiler wrote was Mūscerdas, etc. (with the mark of length over the *u*). Again 92, 1 Insulae agrees so closely with Paulus, p. 98 (as also 20, 27 Arma; 24, 1 Aullas; 27, 49–51 Capulus, etc.) that it can hardly be anything but a Festus gloss. (Does the mysterious *ut in mari natum* of 92, 3 belong to it?)

Enough has been said to prove that there are Festus glosses in Abol. To attempt a full list of them is not my purpose here; but this is a suitable opportunity for discussing a point of importance. Some possible Festus glosses appear in Cass. only, not in Vat. How can we decide whether they appeared in the archetype? A good example is 185, 41[b] Tongiliatim loqui: pravis verbis, a Tongilio parasito qui hoc invenerat risus aucupium, ut salutanti convicium responderet, maledicentem blandissime salutaret.

That Cass., the later MS., has many insertions is undoubted (cf. Goetz' apparatus passim). The three Eucherius glosses (which observe the order of their occurrence in the Formulae) at the beginning of the AR- section (20, 17–19) are quite likely to be insertions (Vat. n.l.). The beginnings and ends of sections are appropriate places for insertions. But just as Cass. often shews the correct form of a gloss (e.g. the Offendix gloss 132, 3) where Vat. has departed from the archetype, so Cass. may and often does retain a gloss of the archetype which Vat. has omitted. The omission in Vat. may be an accident; e.g. the omission of Remillo and Recellit after Recellens (162, 6)

is clearly due to a 'saltus oculi' from *Recellens* to *Recellit*. It may be designed, in the case of long glosses; for these spoil the symmetry of an uncial page (more than in minuscule) and are apt to be sacrificed to convenience. We have clear traces of the deliberate curtailment of long glosses in Vat.: e.g. the Abstr. gloss Pyra is curtailed to three words (143, 35): compare Culleus (47, 20) and Excetra (70, 22) and Decrepiti (50, 29) and De dimenso tuo (50, 24) and Fitilla (76, 47). The long Abstr. gloss Labyrinthum (103, 26ª) is wholly omitted. Now Festus glosses would often be long; so we must give Cass. the benefit of the doubt in such a gloss as Tongiliatim loqui. On the other hand the long gloss Asylum which Cass. offers in the AB- section (3, 20ª) comes from the Placidus Glossary; and a borrowing from Placidus (124, 1 Neotericus cannot be proved to be a Placidus gloss, though it is worthy of the Christian 'semidoctus') or the pseudo-Placidus Glossary (133, 27, Opplere: oblivisci ad plenum, really does seem a misapprehension of Oppletum: oblĭtum usque ad plenum) has yet to be proved. And Cass. has interpolated from Isidore such long glosses as Mitra (117, 12ª) and Monile (118, 28ª), from Etym. 19, 31, 4 and 12; Melotes (115, 12ª), from Etym. 19, 24, 19. (Since 6, 9ª Aconita[s] presumably comes from Etym. 17, 9, 25, the Latin Thesaurus should not give prominence, s.v. aconitum, to the miswriting in Cass.)

A famous Leyden glossary has been resolved by Dr Hessels into its constituent atoms with the help of the headings which are prefixed to each part (Glossae Verborum de Canonibus; de Eusebio; de Catalogo Hieronymi, etc.). The Abolita Glossary has no such divisions and no such headings, and its re-arrangement has reached the AB- stage, so that even the detection of all the books used by its compiler may be now unattainable. Still the Virgil glosses and Terence glosses can be discriminated without too much difficulty (it is unfortunate that this was not rightly recognized when Goetz wrote the Thesaurus Glossarum) and two slighter threads are easy to pick out. One is a list of Greek technical terms of rhetoric, etc., e.g. at the end of the AN- section, Antiphrasis (18, 35) to Analogia (18, 45). The gloss Antiphrasis is longer than the rest and reappears in

fuller form in Anecd. Helv. p. xlviii (Lib. Gloss.) where the characteristic addition of an example from the Bible has suggested to more than one scholar the work of Julian of Toledo (Hagen in Anecd. Helv. p. xliv; Funaioli in Riv. Filol. 39, 42 sqq.). Another thread is a list from some Onomatologia Sacra(?), e.g. in the AB- section (5, 17) Abennezer: lapis adiutorii.

What of the rest? Since the known part consists of 'glossae collectae' from authors (Virgil, Terence, etc.), we have a right to infer that the unknown part is similarly composed, and that a lucky discovery or two may enable us to map out the whole region. Let us take the CO- section, one of the longest, as a sample of the Abolita Glossary; for the Latin Thesaurus is available for this part. The glosses within square brackets are some 300 in all, but if we identify with the help of the Thes. Gloss. the intruders from the Abstrusa Glossary, the number is reduced by about forty. Thus 40, 4–7 = 39, 17–20; or to take an example from the AE- section, 12, 3 Aeneatores: tubicines is an Abstrusa gloss (12, 3–4 = 11, 47–48) which has intruded (by the avenue of 'cross-reference,' or of 'marginal correction'); although 12, 11 Aenatores: cornicines is genuine Abol., perhaps a Festus gloss (cf. Paul. 18 Aenatores cornicines dicuntur, id est cornu canentes). Any gloss which appears in Abstr. as well as Abol. must be really an Abstrusa gloss and must therefore be ignored in our investigation of the Abolita Glossary. And this reduced number, say 260, is further reduced by some half-dozen through the detection of repetitions. Thus the gloss, apparently a Virgil gloss (from Aen. 2, 1), Conticuere: tacuerunt, appears at 36, 15 in correct and 38, 22 and 39, 22 in incorrect form. Since it seems an isolated gloss, its true place is hard to tell. And, no doubt, a certain number more may be subtracted as mere fragments; e.g. 44, 20, Cornicines: qui cum cornibus cantant, may be the second half of the gloss Aenatores, just mentioned, and properly belong to the Festus-contingent in the AE- section. This possibility must always be reckoned with in investigating glosses; e.g. 31, 25 becomes intelligible if its original form was ⟨Caducos⟩: casuros vel cadentes; 23, 38, which parades as an Abol. gloss, is the second half of the Abstr.

gloss 23, 9 : although the Latin Thesaurus does not allow us to refer Catervatus (29, 2) to any writer, we must remember that the original gloss may have been ⟨Stipatus⟩: catervatus, multitudine circumdatus, possibly a Virgil gloss like the preceding Cano and the following Cantus dederunt. Further, 45, 23–24 may be one gloss Contactus: inquinatus, contagie (-io ?) contactus [in culturis ?], just as 45, 18–19 are one, Colon dictio longa, Comma brevis.

With these reductions we find that the CO- section, which we have taken as a sample of the whole Abolita Glossary, offers less than 250 glosses for our investigation. At (or about) the beginning comes an apparent Festus-batch. The last (36, 28) contains, I think, a citation, its real form being Comtionalis senex: ⟨...'comtionalis senex⟩ emptus (-tu's), manu missus (-su's) et tutor auctor factus (-tu's).' If so, the citations in the Latin Thesaurus, s.v. comptionalis (or rather the etymological but not current spelling 'coemptionalis') must be raised from two to four, since the sentence of Livy (3, 72, 3 comtionali seni) which stands s.v. contionalis must certainly be transferred here. (On the spelling -mt-, -ms- in Livy see Wessely's preface to the Sijthoff facsimile of the Vienna codex.) With the mistake *cont-* for *comt-* compare 38, 39 Contius: ornatius. After the Festus-batch comes a long Virgil-batch. Then, somewhere on p. 38 (a page full of Abstr. intruders, as are also pp. 39–40) we are lost, until we find ourselves again on 'terra cognita' at the Apuleius-batch on p. 40. A long Terence-batch seems to follow. Then another unknown region on pp. 44–45. Finally a second Virgil-batch.

The amount of 'terra incognita' is therefore not so very large. The discovery of a single author used as fully as Terence has been used would almost suffice to redeem it. The Latin Thesaurus enables us to ascertain that it is in none of the works recognized by that comprehensive lexicon but rather in later works (of Spanish[1] ecclesiastics, etc. ?) that the sources will have to be sought of such glosses as Condensantes

[1] A Spanish compiler is suggested by the use of *callis* for 'a town-lane' in the gloss Angiportum. Cf. Class. Quart. 6, 39.

(38, 31), Cottidianitas (38, 35), Constuduit (38, 37). The discovery of even one such source might throw enough light to facilitate the separation of the Festus glosses from the mass. For the present we may console ourselves with the reflection that, if it is a virtue for the student of grammar 'aliqua nescire,' the student of glossaries must usually make a virtue of the necessity 'pleraque nescire.'

W. M. LINDSAY.

HORACE *CARM.* I 14.

O navis, referent in mare te novi
Fluctus? O quid agis? Fortiter occupa
  Portum. Nonne vides ut
    Nudum remigio latus
Et malus celeri saucius Africo
Antennaeque gemant, ac sine funibus
  Vix durare carinae
    Possint imperiosius
Aequor? Non tibi sunt integra lintea,
Non di, quos iterum pressa voces malo.
  Quamvis Pontica pinus,
    Silvae filia nobilis,
Iactes et genus et nomen inutile,
Nil pictis timidus navita puppibus
  Fidit: tu nisi ventis
    Debes ludibrium, cave.
Nuper sollicitum quae mihi taedium,
Nunc desiderium curaque non levis,
  Interfusa nitentes
    Vites aequora Cycladas.

The poem is an allegory; the ship is the ship of state. So much Quintilian tells us expressly (viii 8, 44): *ἀλληγορία*, quam inversionem interpretantur, aliud verbis, aliud sensu ostendit, etiam interim contrarium. Prius, ut *O navis...portum* totusque ille Horatii locus, quo navem pro republica, fluctuum tempestates pro bellis civilibus, portum pro pace et concordia dicit. In the face of words like this it seems to me impertinent, almost indecent, to dispute the generally allegorical character of the ode.

But when we come to the real meaning of it, the problem assumes a different aspect. For the many guesses which have been given it will be sufficient to refer to the commentators, and the summary given by Orelli; pensitatis interpretum sententiis de huius carminis argumento ac tempore id lucramur, ut ex incertis incertiores fiamus. No fresh light, so far as I am aware, has been thrown since Orelli's day, and recent editions give up any attempt to define more closely.

Any solution has to explain two points, which must, if the ode has any inner meaning at all, be significant guides. Why is the Roman state called a "Pontic" keel? And why is there special danger for her in the channels between the Cyclades? The latter especially, from its emphatic position at the end, must be the kernel of the whole allegory.

To say, with Wickham, that "the pine of Pontus, the Cyclades, belong to the ship" is merely a helpless abandonment of any claim of Horace to be worth a moment's attention so far as his use of words is concerned. All ships were not built in Pontus, nor were they employed in nothing else than in sailing through the Cyclades.

Pontus was of course one of the greatest, perhaps the greatest, of all the ancient seats of ship-building. So was Bithynia, where Catullus bought his yacht; and in I xxxv 10 "Bithyna," and for that matter the Carpathium pelagus, may be said to "belong to the ship." But there were other famous centres of ship-building, notably Ida; and commentators have not failed to ask why Horace did not call the Roman state an "Idaean keel," with an obviously appropriate reference to the origin of Rome. What is obvious to us must have been at least equally obvious to Horace; if he said "Pontic" and not "Idaean," it must have been with a purpose. A poet cannot venture upon allegory without weighing every word and assuring himself that it has a definite reference to his hidden meaning. But he may have it in view to obscure that meaning for reasons of his own. Horace may have wished the careless reader to be misled by the parallel of Pontica and Cyclades with Bithyna and Carpathium; but if he was really writing an allegory to be understood only by the *συνετοί*—and that is presumably

the case here—he must have been all the more anxious in the choice of words which should lead those for whom he was writing to see through the veil. And I believe that it is still possible to understand, even for us.

Let us turn to another famous passage, which is at all events in pari materia, the prophecy of Juno in III iii 56;

> Sed bellicosis fata Quiritibus
> Hac lege dico, ne nimium pii
> Rebusque fidentes avitae
> Tecta velint reparare Troiae.

All commentators refer here to the passage of Suetonius which tells us that Julius Caesar shortly before his death was contemplating, according to the current rumours of the day, a transference of the capital of the empire from Rome to Alexandria (apparently A. Troas) or Ilium. The conclusion commonly—and in my opinion rightly—drawn is that these rumours were revived in Augustus' day, and that the Prophecy of Juno is to be regarded as a denial, almost semi-official, of their correctness. The earlier poem, I believe, deals with the same theme; it is a covert but passionate protest against the removal of the seat of government—passionate because the danger is sincerely believed to be a real one, and covert because it would not be safe to utter an open attack upon a policy which to all appearance was seriously entertained by Augustus.

One thing at least is clear—that, whether he seriously entertained it or no, his actions at one time of his life were such that they could not fail to give the impression; the rumours at least had a solid foundation in his movements. For two years after Actium he never went to Rome, but spent nearly his whole time in Egypt or at one point or another of the western coast of Asia Minor. His one hurried visit to Italy looks as though it were designed to emphasise the degradation of Rome. When he was called, during the winter of 31—30 B.C. spent in Samos, to deal with his discontented veterans, he sailed to Brundusium, where the senators and deputations were summoned to meet him; he had no sooner despatched the necessary business in 30 days, than he sailed

again to Corinth, Rhodes, Syria and Egypt. The next winter found him again at Samos, and it was not till August of 29 B.C. that he returned to Rome and celebrated his various triumphs.

This virtual deposition of Rome, though only temporary, had of course its intended effect in teaching the lesson that the capital of the empire was in the headquarters of the imperator, wherever he might be, and so contributed substantially, no doubt, to the establishment of the monarchy. But it must certainly have caused Augustus to consider seriously whether the banishment of Rome might not with advantage be made permanent. The question was of course finally decided in the affirmative by Constantine; but it must at least have forced itself upon Augustus. For several years the empire had practically been divided into an eastern and a western half under separate governments. The two halves had to be reunited, and no one could fail to ask whether a new capital, somewhere on the borders of the two, would not form a more central and therefore more effective seat of government. Rome was at the time enthusiastic on behalf of Ilium, its legendary birth-place; and if the change had to be made, Ilium suggested itself inevitably as the least shock to national sentiment.

It had another claim to consideration. The tendency to fission between east and west clearly dated from the overthrow of Mithridates and the annexation of his kingdom some thirty years back. It was this vast addition of territory which had displaced so materially the centre of gravity of the empire. "Rome has become a Pontic power"—so would run the argument for the removal—"and the Pontic territories must be ruled from the water-way between the seas." The argument was a sound one and ultimately prevailed; it probably may have failed in Augustus' mind only because Ilium was a site impossible for a great town, in spite of its command of the water-way; and because public sentiment confined the choice to this one place on the Hellespont. Alexandria Troas might have done; but after all, near though it was to Troy, it was not Troy, and had none of the glamour.

There is then good ground for supposing that the fears of a transference of the capital were not unfounded in the year

following Actium; and the ode is perfectly adapted to an expression of those fears at that particular moment. The battered ship of state is represented as having reached the harbour-bar, and as being about to enter when there is a sudden danger that it will set out to sea again, unfitted and unseaworthy. That is exactly the state of feeling which must have prevailed at Rome when it was learnt that Augustus was not coming further than Brundusium. Horace implores the ship boldly to put into port—let the government be once more settled, and settled finally, in the old capital.

The Pontica pinus now explains itself. To say "I admit that you are a Pontic keel" is the allegorical and poetical way of saying "I admit that you have become a Pontic power"—the great argument of the other side. "What of that?" Horace replies: "it is no more than a grand phrase; and in times of stress policy must not be built on fine phrases"—they are only the paint on the ship. And it is clear that "Idaean" is the last adjective which Horace could use; that would come from the adversaries. An Idaean ship would be sailing home, if it were bound for Ilium, and that is where Horace is eager that it should not sail.

Not less clear is the allusion to the channels of the Cyclades. They are a finger-post pointing straight to Ilium; they are the portal through which every ship bound for the Hellespont from Italy must needs pass. To say "Avoid the Cyclades" means for an Italian "Do not sail for Ilium."

And I feel confident that there is another key to the problem in the next ode; it is no mere chance that I xiv should be immediately followed by

> Pastor cum traheret per freta navibus
> Idaeis Helenen perfidus hospitam,
> Ingrato celeres obruit otio
> Ventos, ut caneret fera
> Nereus fata.

The two odes of gloomy foreboding are sharply cut off from the rest of the book by others of light character, amatory, personal, playful; "Cum tu, Lydia, Telephi." "O matre pulcra

filia pulcrior," "Velox amoenum saepe Lucretilem." I am convinced that they are meant to be read together.

It will be noticed at once that the "Idaean ships" appear here with all prominence; the purpose of the ode is to bring out to the full the disasters which did once follow a voyage of Idaean ships to Ilium; the moral is obvious. And the scene is marked in the first line as identical with that of the last line of the preceding ode; the narrow seas, *freta*, where the Idaean ships are becalmed to listen to the "cruel dooms" can, for a ship on a voyage from Sparta to Ilium, only be the very channels mentioned in the preceding line, the *aequora interfusa Cycladas*. This juxtaposition is of course certain, quite apart from any interpretation of either of the two odes, and is a clear indication of some connexion of thought.

My conclusion then is that the two poems were composed at the very time of Augustus' visit to Brundusium in the winter of 31—30, and express the incredulous indignation with which the Romans heard that he was to sail away again without coming to Rome—the note of interrogation after *fluctus* seems to me indispensable; "Can it be true that the waves are once more to carry you off?" Probably the pair may first have been handed round among sympathisers; it was not too safe to oppose openly a policy which was suspected—perhaps with good grounds—to be favoured by Caesar. But there was another safeguard against the danger, if they should come out. For they are both capable of a very different interpretation. The Nereus ode would of course pass, as it has always passed, for a purely mythological poem on the old theme of Troy; there is no patent reason why it should not stand for itself on its own poetical merits. But the preceding ode, xiv, inevitably provokes the question "What ship is meant?" If the question were asked in an awkward manner, as it well might be, it was open to Horace to reply, with an air of extreme innocence, "Of course the ship is that on which Caesar has just arrived in Brundusium, and in which I hear, with the greatest alarm for his personal safety, that he means to sail back to Samos. It is an appeal to him not to run such a risk." The ode would thus be a pendant to the other in which he appeals to Virgil's ship

to bring him safe home; Navis quae tibi creditum Debes Vergilium (I 3). There was in fact good reason to fear for Caesar's safety; the voyage from Samos, we are told, had been stormy and dangerous; the ship that bore the emperor's fortunes probably arrived at Brundusium battered and weather-worn; the return voyage through the narrow seas and lee-shores of the Cyclades was full of risks. To know that the emperor was coming at such a season had been to Horace a distressing anxiety; his one desire now was the affectionate longing that such a danger should not be undertaken again. Such would be the ostensible sense of the lines

> Nuper sollicitum quae mihi taedium,
> Nunc desiderium curaque non levis.

The covert sense is of course that which is commonly attributed to them—they mark the change in Horace's attitude towards the state since the days of Brutus.

It may be added that the double interpretation would seem to imply a slight variation in the sense of the phrase "fortiter occupa portum." In the covert sense the port is Rome, which the ship of state has not yet entered; in this case the words mean "boldly enter the port." In the overt sense, the port is Brundusium, where Caesar's ship is lying. I submit with all reserve that they may also mean "cling to the port."

When Augustus returned to Rome eighteen months later, in August 29 B.C., the policy of any removal of the capital was finally abandoned, and there was no longer any harm in publishing the ode. But Rome did not forget the fright it had had, and it is evident that later on it was worth while to let Horace, in the series of odes on patriotism written with the approval of Augustus, put an end once and for all to rumours, by placing a denial of them in the mouth of Juno. But the first expression of alarm, with its double meaning, remains, when properly interpreted, a pretty piece of wit, a real "curiosa felicitas."

WALTER LEAF.

ON SOME ANCIENT PLANT-NAMES. III.

19. *ἄμωμον*, Diosc. 1. 15.

There cannot be much doubt as to the identification of this; the difficulty is to reconcile the conflicting descriptions of ancient authors. To do so in a convincing way would require the aid of illustrations. I can only summarize the main facts.

Theophrastus, or at any rate the author of the ninth book of the *H. P.*, informs us, 9. 7. 2 *τὸ δὲ καρδάμωμον καὶ ἄμωμον οἱ μὲν ἐκ Μηδείας, οἱ δ' ἐξ Ἰνδῶν καὶ ταῦτα καὶ τὴν νάρδον.* As a fact they all came from India; amomi nardique deliciæ... ex India, Plin. *N. H.* 16. 135. But Pliny in his account begins with stating, amomi uva...ex Indica vite labrusca, *N. H.* 12. 48, and then, following Dioscorides, nascitur et in Armeniæ parte... et in Media et in Ponto. But these, as in other cases, were the trade-routes by which the Indian product, varying in condition from the mode of collection and preparation, would reach the West. Pliny, *N. H.* 12. 50, tells us, simile his et nomine et frutice cardamomum. The latter I see no reason to doubt was the familiar Malabar Cardamom *Elettaria Cardamomum*, still in commerce. This belongs to the same family as Ginger, and the problem is to find some Indian plant of that family which will fit *ἄμωμον*. It must be premised that, as in other cases, the ancient writers could never have seen the living plant, though some hearsay account of it may have reached them; they could only describe the fragmentary portions which were met with in commerce.

The description of Dioscorides must be studied from this point of view; it is brief and sufficiently obscure. *ἄμωμόν ἐστι θαμνίσκος οἱονεὶ βότρυς ἐκ ξύλου ἀντεμπεπλεγμένος ἑαυτῷ.* Pliny translates *βότρυς* by uva, but both words, though especially

applied to the grape, have the general sense of cluster; Pliny himself uses uva, 16. 120, of the male flowers of the laurel. *Βότρυς* then was a cluster of dry fruits, *ἐκ ξύλου*, borne on a woody stalk, and closely packed together: this agrees well enough with the strobilus of an *Amomum*: Fée (1823) arrives at this conclusion without hesitation, *Flore de Virgile*, 17, though he fixes on the wrong species.

It is clear from Pliny that in ancient times there were two theories of the source of *ἄμωμον*. He mentions the theory of its origin in a vine only to dismiss it, as he probably saw that no known vine could possibly yield a spice. It was no doubt of literary origin and arose from a misinterpretation of *Βότρυς*. Dioscorides combines both theories and furnishes the plant with *φύλλα βρυωνίᾳ ὅμοια*, i.e. white Bryony, *Bryonia cretica*. The vine theory, however erroneous, is still current; the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, 145, says, 'it [Amomum] may possibly be *Cissus vitigena* (Linn.) a native of Armenia.' This rests on the respectable authority of Sprengel (1807), *Hist. rei herb.* i. 142. More than twenty years later, *Diosc.* ii. 352, he was still of the same opinion, though he had discovered that the plant was not native in Armenia or outside India. Fraas, *Fl. class.* 98, accepts it with hesitation as the source of *ἄμωμον*. But Mr J. E. Gamble, who has no rival in a knowledge of the woody plants of India, informs me that *Cissus vitiginea* (the correct form), or as it is now called *Vitis Linnaei*, is a not very common South Indian species and is not aromatic. I hope this will dispose of the idea that any Indian vine had to do with *ἄμωμον*. It is however only fair to say that Pliny's vitis labrusca and the plant which Dioscorides had in view may represent some report of a wild Indian vine, quite possibly *Vitis repanda*.

We may now turn with more satisfaction to Pliny's second theory, 'ut alii existimavere, e frutice montuoso, palmi altitudine, carpiturque cum radice, manipulatim leniter componitur, protinus fragile.' I have no hesitation in identifying this with the Nepal Cardamom, *Amomum subulatum*; it is an undershrub, frutex, sending up leafy shoots six feet high, native of the Himalayas, montuosus. The inflorescence which in its fruiting stage constituted the spice, springs from the rhizome, radix,

on a short stalk, palmi altitudine. It is, then, a strobilus consisting of densely crowded fruits, each with a subtending bract or scale-like leaf; these in drying become brittle, protinus fragile: in gathering the strobilus it must be gently compressed with the hand, manipulatim leniter componitur. Pliny adds, laudatur quam maxime Punici mali foliis simile: this is a Plinian ellipsis; what he means is quod folia (i.e. bracts) habet quam maxime Punici mali foliis similia; most like Pomegranate leaves, and therefore unmutilated and colore rufo. These were guarantees of freshness; old samples were bleached, pessimumque candidum, quod et vetustate evenit.

Drug-collectors played tricks, and we know from Galen that physicians had to learn to scrutinize their drugs with care. *διὸ καὶ πολλάκις χρὴ τεθεᾶσθαι τὸν μέλλοντα διαγινώσκειν καὶ διακρίνειν ἀλλήλων τὰ παραπλήσια*, 14. 56. Pliny tells us that dilapidated samples of *ἄμωμον* were 'faked' by gumming in pomegranate leaves to replace the defective bracts; adulteratur foliis Punicis et gummi liquido, ut cohæreat convolvatque se in uvæ modum.

I confess myself baffled by what Dioscorides says about *ἀμωμίς*, but so was Pliny, apparet aut aliud esse aut colligi immaturum, *N. H.* 12. 49. I do not doubt that the latter was the truth.

We now have a consistent account of the Cardamoms known to the ancients. *ἄμωμον* came from North India and found its way to Europe overland; *καρδάμωμον* reached it by sea from Southern India. In the second century A.D. both were equally seaborne and liable to duty at the port of Alexandria, Flück. and Hanb. *Pharmacogr.* 644. At the present time *ἄμωμον* has disappeared from European commerce, having been supplanted by the Malabar Cardamom for which even in India it is only "a cheap substitute," Watt, *Comm. Prod. of India*, 65.

Ray's *Historia* put me on the track of the *Commentarius de Amomo* of Nicolo Marogna, 1608; it must be a rare book but I fortunately found it in the Kew Library. By an exhaustive examination of the texts he identifies *ἄμωμον* conclusively with the strobilus of an *Amomum*. His work seems to have fallen into oblivion. It was unknown to Sprengel: had it been other-

wise, it would have saved much trouble and confusion and perhaps made this note unnecessary.

There remains the perplexing question of the etymology of *ἄμωμον*. It is represented in Aramaic by ḥămāmā and it has been hoped that this might yield to investigation. But Sir Charles Lyall tells me that "it only occurs in Syriac glossaries (where the explanations are given in Arabic) and it is from these only that we know of the Aramaic and the borrowed Arabic form; they do not occur in literature." We are driven therefore to the conclusion that the Aramaic word is only Semiticized Greek. This seems to be the opinion of the writer in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* who has "='blameless'?". He quotes Salmasius, *in Solin.* 284, for its use 'of any odour pure and sweet.' But Salmasius makes play with *κιννάμωμον* and *καρδάμωμον* which are not relevant; he quotes from Hesychius *ἄμωμον, ἐν ταῖς ὀνομασίαις ὁ λιβανωτός*, i.e. frankincense. I have not access to Hesychius, but Stephanus, 10931 C., gives *ἀμφῶμος*, the synonymy is therefore not free from doubt. Dioscorides 1. 68. 2 under *λίβανος* has *λέγεται δέ τις καὶ ἀμωμίτης*; but this may only imply that some sort of *λιβανος* recalled the odour of *ἄμωμον*. However it convinced Sprengel, *Dioscor.* 2. 379, who says *ἄμωμον* vocabatur quodvis aroma purum et non vitiatum.

Of the etymology of *κιννάμωμον* we know nothing beyond the statement of Herodotus, 3. 111, *ἀπὸ Φοινίκων μαθόντες κιννάμωμον καλέομεν*. It cannot therefore be an expanded form of the Hebrew ḳinnāmōn; as *κίναμον* this only occurs in Nic. T. 947 perhaps from metrical necessity; it is used as a synonym by Pliny, *N. H.* 12. 86, cinnamum.

It is certainly singular that *καρδάμωμον* and *κάρδαμον* seem at first sight related in the same way. But in this case we have to deal with two dissimilar things. We owe the name and our first knowledge of *κάρδαμον* to Xenophon; it was our garden cress, *Lepidium sativum*, of Persian origin: it was eaten by the Persians as an *ὄψον* with bread, as we ourselves still use it. The etymology is unknown: but Sir Charles Lyall suggests:—'apparently Xenophon picked up the word *κάρδαμον* in Aramaic-speaking countries. One thinks of the Aramaic

ḫardalā, Arabic khardal which means mustard.' Stephanus says '*καρδάμωμον* a cardamo denominatum videtur,' and this is not wholly improbable. Galen 19. 742 has *ἀντὶ σινήπεως, κάρδαμον ἢ καρδάμωμον*; both were therefore used as medicinal substitutes for mustard; the Greek mustard by the way was the milder *Sinapis alba*. I hazard the suggestion that of the two Cardamoms, *ἄμωμον* was that first known to the Greeks and that the South Indian kind was distinguished as *καρδάμωμον*, the prefix being borrowed from *κάρδαμον*.

This still leaves *ἄμωμον* in the air etymologically. I confess I am not convinced by Salmasius that it = sincerum. It seems to me that he cuts the throat of his argument by bringing in *νάρδου πιστικῆς*, Ev. Marc. 14. 3; I myself have no doubt that this much debated expression simply means 'pure nard,' but it tells against *ἄμωμος* being the word in use in such a sense. If Voss could have substantiated his theory that *κάλλος* meant 'a sweet unguent,' *κάλλει τ' ἀμώμῳ*, Aesch. *Pers.* 185, might have been conclusive. But the word which the Greeks would have been more likely to use about *φάρμακα* and *ἀρώματα* was *ἄδολος*. One calls to mind *φαρμασσομένη χρίματος...ἀδόλοισι παρηγορίαις*, Aesch. *Ag.* 94; *ἄδολος* [*στύραξ*] Diosc. 1. 66 and *ἄδολον γάλα*, Ep. Petr. 1. 2. 2.

20. *ἡ ἄμπελος τῆς Ἴδης*, Theophr. *H. P.* 3. 17. 6.

One may wonder how many readers of Scott's lines in the *Lady of the Lake*, 1. 26,

> Where Ellen's hand had taught to twine
> The Ivy and Idæan vine,

know that the latter phrase traces back to an obscure and much debated passage in Theophrastus, *φύεται μὲν τῆς Ἴδης περὶ τὰς Φαλάκρας καλουμένας*. Nicander, T. 668, has of another plant *ὑπὸ σκοπέλοισι Φαλακραίοις*, but the Scholiast explains that *Φαλάκρα* was one of the four summits of *τῆς ἐν Τροίᾳ παρακειμένης Ἴδης*. This disposes of the quite baseless statement of Karl Koch that the Cretan Ida was intended.

The labours of the botanists of the 16th century were vitiated by the assumption that the plants of Greece were to be found in Central Europe, which is far from being the case. Many wild identifications were the result, the incubus of which it is still difficult to shake off. The *ἄμπελος τῆς Ἴδης* of Theophrastus was *θαμνῶδες* with *ῥᾶγες μέλαιναι*. It was promptly settled to be the whortleberry, *Vaccinium Myrtillus*, a native of Arctic and Northern regions which certainly does not grow on either the Mysian or the Cretan Ida. Bodæus rejects the identification but can suggest no other: Ray also rejects it but adds, non video cur ad id genus non possit referri, eodemque nomine generico insigniri, *Hist.* ii. 1487. Vitis Idæa was in fact used generically in the middle ages for various plants allied to the whortleberry; to one of these, the Cranberry, Linnæus gave the name *Vaccinium Vitis Idæa*. This does not count for much as he confessedly adopted ancient names at haphazard. But it kept Vitis Idæa floating in botanical literature.

C. Bauhin, 1671, who simply contented himself in his admirable *Pinax* with reducing to order the discordant synonyms of previous writers, follows tradition in leaving the Vitis Idæa of Theophrastus as the whortleberry. All the modern German authorities, Billerbeck, Fraas, Lenz, down to the most recent, Karl Koch, are content to follow.

An obvious difficulty is that in all other cases *ἄμπ-ελ-ος* implies a climbing plant. This accords with Pott's etymology, Curtius, I. 448, from *ἀμφί* and Fελ, 'clasping (with tendrils).' But the whortleberry is a dwarf shrub. Bauhin, 470, must have had his own doubts, for he makes the significant remark, 'idem paene Plinius, l. 14. c. 3.' This is the passage, Plin. *N. H.* 14. 43:—Alexandrina appellatur vitis circa Phalacram brevis, ramis cubitalibus, acino nigro fabæ magnitudine, nucleo molli et minimo, obliquis racemis prædulcibus, folio parvo et rotundo, sine divisuris. This is a verbal translation from Theophrastus: Alexandria was of course the town in the Troad. Pliny unhesitatingly then includes the *ἄμπελος τῆς Ἴδης* amongst the cultivated races of the Vine of which he gives a long enumeration. Having got the clue it is easy to see that what Theophrastus has given us is an excellent description of the Corinth (hence

'Currant') Vine, *Vitis vinifera*, var. *apyrena*. It was doubtless cultivated on the slopes of Ida, and was θαμνῶδες because kept low for cultural convenience.

Nullum est jam dictum, quod non dictum sit prius. Looking casually into Gerarde's Herbal (1597), I was not a little astonished to find, pp. 1231, 2, the problem completely solved, a fact, as far as I can ascertain, ignored by every subsequent writer. He says that 'Vitis Idea' was 'a kinde of Vine' and identifies it with 'the Corinth tree,' i.e. the Currant Vine. He even quotes Philostratus, to whom I have not access, as stating that 'like unto this Vine' are those which grow in Lydia, which would be probable enough. Gerarde was notoriously nothing of a scholar and the whole of this proves to have been borrowed from Dodonæus (1583) *Stirp. Hist. Pempt.* 411 and 757, to whom the credit must be given.

Down to the time of Pliny the Currant Vine was only known as a product of the Troad. When introduced into Greece its cultivation was at first confined to Corinth, for the production of 'Raisins of Corinth' 'which Gerarde says are commonly called Corans or Currans'; in less popular language they were Uvæ Corinthiacæ and Passulæ minores. At the present day Heldreich (*Die Nutzpflanzen Griechenlands*, p. 43) says:— Bekanntlich sind die Korinthen eines der hauptsächlichsten Produkte Griechenlands und bilden eine bedeutende Einnahmequelle mehrerer Provinzen. A recent writer sees in 'the currant bun of the village shop...a powerful benefactor to Greece.'

In the 16th century the *Corinthia uva* had found its way westward. Lobel and Pena, *Adversaria* (1571) 278, say:— Ad topiariorum pergulas et fornices deducuntur hodie in Italicis et Pedemontanis hortis vites hujus. The story of the 'Lady of the Lake' is laid in the early part of the 16th century. That century was an age of botanical enterprise and the cultivation of exotic plants. It is not therefore impossible that the Currant Vine had reached Great Britain. But it does not seem probable, for Lobel remarks 'sed algidioris cœli impatiens.' And I must confess that I have not found any record of its ever being cultivated in our gardens. Scott's knowledge of it

must have been purely literary. He was so omnivorous in his reading that it is idle to speculate where he browsed or where he did not. He may have picked up the name from Gerarde. In his next lines,

> The clematis, the favour'd flower
> Which boasts the name of Virgin bower,

certainly comes straight out of Gerarde who grew it in his garden at Holborn. It was *Clematis Viticella*, a native of Southern Europe.

Dodonæus is no doubt right in identifying with the Currant Vine, *op. cit.* 411, the second kind of *ἄμπελος ἀγρία* which Dioscorides, 5. 2, describes as *μικρόρραξ οὖσα*.

21. *σικύα*, Theophr. *H. P.* 1. 13. 3.

σικύα has not hitherto been identified definitely. Theophrastus says:—*ἐν δὲ τοῖς λαχανηροῖς ὅ τε σίκυος καὶ ἡ κολοκύντη καὶ ἡ σικύα· πάντα γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν καρπῶν ἔχει καὶ προσαυξανομένων ἐπιμένει τὰ ἄνθη πολὺν χρόνον*. This fixes it botanically as a cucurbit grown as a pot-herb. *σίκυος*, hellenized from Sanskrit soukasa, was the cucumber, *Cucumis sativus*, brought from Northern India which was also the original home of the gourd, *Cucurbita maxima*. Cultivated cucurbits are very similar in habit and the Greeks would not appreciate technical botanical distinctions. They could only rely on what was obvious to the eye, such as the fruit. Theophrastus remarks incidentally, *H. P.* 1. 11. 4, *τὰ* [sc. *σπέρματα*] *δὲ διεστῶτα καὶ στοιχηδὸν ὥσπερ τὰ τῆς κολοκύντης καὶ σικύας καὶ τῶν δένδρων ὡς Περσικῆς μηλέας*. The arrangement of the seeds in both was like that of the citron. Notwithstanding the resemblance of the name it is clear that *σικύα* suggested a gourd rather than a cucumber. Athenæus gives us a good deal of further information. *Ἑλληνσπόντιοι δε σικύας μὲν τὰς μακρὰς καλοῦσι κολοκύντας δὲ τὰς περιφερεῖς*, 59 A; it was therefore distinguishable from the gourd proper. But like that it came from India; *Εὐθύδημος Ἀθηναῖος ἐν τῷδε περὶ λαχανων σικύαν Ἰνδικὴν καλεῖ τὴν κολοκύντην, διὰ τὸ κεκομίσθαι τὸ σπέρμα ἐκ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς*, Ath. 58 F. This fixes it as the bottle-

gourd or calabash of Southern India, *Lagenaria vulgaris*. It was known to the Egyptians, Loret, *Fl. Pharaonique* 74, from whom it would reach the Greeks: it came by sea, while the gourd proper, which the Egyptians did not possess, came to Europe overland. The bottle-gourd, as its name indicates, is not spherical but its swollen part narrows into a neck; hence Galen, *Ling. Hipp. Expl.*, 19. 137, calls it (*σικυώνη*) *τὴν ἀπιοειδῆ κολοκύνθην*. Columella describes this, 10. 383, e tenui collo semen lege: sive globosi corporis. The rind when mature hardens into a tough shell: the gourds when cleaned out are used in the East for innumerable purposes. This was the case in Italy at the commencement of the Christian era. Cucurbitarum numerosior usus...nuper in balnearum usum venere urceorum vice, iam pridem vero etiam cadorum ad vina condenda, Plin. *N. H.* 19. 71. Columella, 10. 385–8, tells the same story,

> sobolem dabit illa capacem
> Naryciæ picis, aut Actæi mellis Hymetti,
> Aut habilem lymphis hamulam, Bacchove lagœnam,
> Tum pueros eadem fluviis innare docebit.

I find no reference to any similar use in Greece. A statement in Theophrastus, *H. P.* 7. 3. 5, has hardly been understood for want of knowledge of Eastern practices; *ἡ γὰρ σικύα ὁμοιοσχήμων γίνεται ἐν ᾧ ἂν τεθῇ ἀγγείῳ*. The rind of the young fruit at the time it is used as a potherb is soft and plastic. It is a favourite amusement with the Chinese and Japanese to bind it in various ways or grow it in a mould of which as it expands it takes the shape and even the impression of inscriptions in high relief; crescitque qua cogitur forma, Pl. *N. H.* 19. 70.

But the Greeks got a very specialized instrument from the bottle-gourd: for it supplied Galen's *τὴν ἰατρικὴν σικύαν*, 19. 137, the primitive 'cupping glass.' This was Juvenal's ventosa cucurbita, 14. 58; but it by no means had 'the shape of a gourd' as Macleane says. Galen tells us exactly what it was like, *τὴν ἀπύθμενον καὶ κωνοειδῆ σικύαν*. It is obvious that such a thing, wide at the bottom and narrow at the top, could readily be cut out of a bottle-gourd of moderate size.

The difference of accent shows that *σικύα* could not be merely a feminine of *σίκυος*. Galen gives as a synonym the extended form *σικυώνη*, of which one may conjecture that it was an abbreviation, and Athenæus tells us, 58 F, *Μεγαλοπολῖται δ' αὐτὴν* [sc. *σικύαν*] *Σικυωνίαν ὀνομάζουσι*. Sicyon was an industrial city; it was celebrated for the manufacture of shoes, et pulchra in pedibus Sicyonia rident, Lucret. 4. 1121. It may be conjectured that a minor industry was the production of the bottle-gourd and its conversion into various articles including 'cupping-glasses.'

22. Colocasia, Verg. *E.* 4. 20.

A good deal of ingenuity has been wasted by Sprengel and others on the etymology of *κολοκασία*; for Sir Charles Lyall informs me that there is no difficulty in accepting it as the hellenized form of the Sanskrit kāla-kachu, the name of an important Indian food-plant, *Colocasia antiquorum*. He tells me that *ch* is pronounced in W. India as *ts* and in N. E. India as *s*. This plant has spread through the tropics of the whole world; it is the Taro of the Polynesians and the Eddoes of W. Indian negroes. Under cultivation it has 'improved' and has produced many new races, some tolerant of a cooler climate. Technically it is an Aroid: it is a member of a plant-family in which the minute flowers are borne on a column-like structure, which has given rise to indecorous suggestion. The whole is enclosed in a modified leaf called a spathe. The Cuckoo-pint of our hedge-rows (*Arum maculatum*) will serve as a type. Its southern representative, *Arum italicum*, is the *τὸ ἄρον τὸ ἐδώδιμον* of Theophr. *H. P.* 7. 13. 2.

Colocasia was introduced from India into Egypt though at no very early time; its Arabic name qulqās obviously derives from *κολοκασία*. Its botanical affinity was recognized though its stature far exceeded that of any other Aroid either in Europe or in N. Africa. Pliny, *N. H.* 19. 96, describes it at second-hand:—"est...quod in Ægypto aron vocant, scillæ proximum amplitudine, foliis lapathi, caule recto duum cubitorum, baculi crassitudine, radice mollioris naturæ, quæ estur et cruda."

The reference to the squill comes in awkwardly, and shows that Pliny missed the point that it was only a measure of the size of the root: the squill has a bulb as large as a man's head; Pericles was called σχινο-κέφαλος because he had a head like one, σχῖνος being a synonym. Galen mentions colocasia, 6. 650, as τὸ ἄρον ἀπὸ τῆς Κυρήνης and says that it had been introduced into Italy. It carried with it its oriental name, and Pliny, *N. H.* 21. 87 describes it under this:—"hanc e Nilo metunt, caule, cum coctus est, araneoso in mandendo, thyrso autem, qui inter folia emicat, spectabili, foliis latissimis...seritur iam hæc in Italia." Thyrsus is the club-like inflorescence, and caulis is a thick leaf-stalk; for colocasia has no proper stem, the leaves springing directly from the underground tuber. Martial 13. 57 ridicules colocasia as a pot-herb;

> Niliacum ridebis olus, lanasque sequaces,
> Improba cum morsu fila manuque trahes.

This was because the Romans had not learnt how to treat it: the natives of India first peel off the fibrous cortex of the leaf-stalk, and then cook the inner portion; the Romans apparently did not eat the tuber, though from Pliny's other account the Egyptians did.

Columella, 8. 15. 4, only recommends colocasia as a suitable plant for a duck-pond; the inference is that it was not cultivated in his time as an article of food, though it soon was so. Palladius prescribes, along with other culinary plants, the planting of the bulbi, 3. 24. 14, and of the plantaria, 5. 3. 5: these were offsets from the tuber, and the method is that still used in India.

Conington, *Verg.* 1. 49, has the following note on the passage in the Bucolics:—"'colocasium' is the Egyptian bean, which was introduced into Italy." This was *Nelumbium speciosum.* But Martyn, a sound botanist and scholar, to whom he usually goes for his botany, was clear upon a careful study of the authorities, *Virg.* 1. 172, that what Virgil meant was the plant now known as *Colocasia antiquorum.* He also makes another point which Conington overlooks: the acanthus was not the garden plant, *Acanthus mollis,* which no one would call ridens,

but the Egyptian Shittah tree, *Acacia arabica*. Virgil had Egypt in his mind and thought that in the Golden Age its products would enrich a new home. The prophecy is so far fulfilled that colocasia now grows spontaneously in many parts of Italy and under the name of Caladium is to be seen as a summer decoration in our public gardens.

Conington was not, however, without justification: for Pliny, *N. H.* 21. 87, has 'colocasia, quam cyamon aliqui vocant,' and this is *κύαμος Αἰγύπτιος Nelumbium speciosum*. Pliny goes on, as already shown, to describe the Aroid, but concludes, with that synthetic propensity which so often lands him in difficulty, by adding a statement as to the use of the leaves for drinking-cups which can only apply to *Nelumbium*. He has clearly mixed up two different things. As to the name he had authority: for Athenaeus, 72 B, quotes Nicander as describing the roots of *Nelumbium* as *τὰ ὑπ' Ἀλεξανδρέων κολοκάσια καλούμενα*, and later on he quotes Diphilus Siphnius, *ἡ τοῦ κυάμου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου ῥίζα, ἥτις λέγεται κολοκάσιον, εὐστόμαχός τέ ἐστι*. This would take back the introduction of the real *κολοκασία* to the 2nd century, B.C., as the name could hardly have obtained currency in Egypt unless the plant had come with it. Nicander himself, *Fr.* 82, has *κυάμου κολοκάσιον* which Pliny probably had in mind: and he is followed by Dioscorides, 2. 106. The only conclusion that can be drawn is that the Greeks adopted *κολοκάσιον* in a general sense for an edible tuberous root just as potato is used in English for various plants which have nothing else in common but their tubers.

Joret (*Plantes dans l'antiquité*, 1. 68) thinks that the introduction of colocasia into Egypt took place 'vers le commencement de notre ère.' But it is difficult to resist its identification with *τὸ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καλούμενον οἴνιγγον* described by Theophrastus, *H. P.* 1. 6. 11. He says:—*τὰ μὲν γὰρ φύλλα μεγαλα καὶ ὁ βλαστὸς αὐτοῦ βραχύς, ἡ δὲ ῥίζα μακρὰ καί ἐστιν ὥσπερ ὁ καρπός. διαφέρει τε καὶ ἐσθίεται*. For practical purposes the tuberous root was the 'fruit'; as a fact the cultivated strain of colocasia, like our potato, had almost lost ability to flower.

Theophrastus, *H. P.* 4. 8. 7, gives a full description of the

κύαμος. Pliny, *N. H.* 18. 121, 2, translates this almost *verbatim* and tacks it on to his description of the ordinary bean, faba. It is clear that he could not have had any first hand knowledge of *Nelumbium* and the inference is that in his time it was not cultivated in Italy. It cannot as a fact be grown more than temporarily in Southern Europe or without some artificial protection and even then succumbs to a winter of any severity; nor has it succeeded in holding its ground in Egypt. Pliny is content to include it amongst legumina, inter quæ maxime honos fabæ, 18. 117. So persistent is error that we find Liddell and Scott still describing *Nelumbium* as having a 'leguminous fruit' (s.v. λωτός). Nothing could be more unlike; for *Nelumbium* is a gigantic water-lily which bears a receptacle, not inaptly compared by Theophrastus to a wasp's nest (σφηκίον). A more exact comparison is to the rose of a watering pot; it has pits on its upper surface and each of these contains a bean-like seed; it was called κιβώριον. Beyond the superficial resemblance of the seeds, *Nelumbium* had nothing in common with the bean.

Herodotus, 2. 37, declares that the true bean was neither cultivated nor eaten by the Egyptians:—κυάμους δὲ οὔτε τι μάλα σπείρουσι Αἰγύπτιοι ἐν τῇ χώρῃ, τούς τε γενομένους οὔτε τρώγουσι οὔτε ἕψοντες πατέονται. Its avoidance passed to the Pythagoreans; Pythagorica sententia damnata: ut alii tradidere, quoniam mortuorum animæ sint in ea, Plin. *N. H.* 18. 118. Yet Loret (*La Flore Pharaonique*, 111) shows that the statement of Herodotus is far too sweeping, as beans are found amongst funeral offerings in the tombs; cf. Woenig, *Die Pflanzen im Alten Ægypten*, 212 and Joret, l. c. i. 55. On the other hand the *Nelumbium* was an especially sacred plant, as it still is in the East. And though Herodotus says, 2. 92, that its seeds were eaten, it is more than probable that the priests would abstain from them. The prohibition, or at any rate a belief in it, might extend to the ordinary bean itself.

Athenæus identifies κολοκασία with *Nelumbium* and tells us, 72 B, ἔστι δ' ἐν Σικυῶνι Κολοκασίας Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερόν. It is clear from the context that he means this to be taken as a fact. Considering that *Nelumbium* was little known to the Greeks

except as an Egyptian plant, it is certainly surprising. Two attempts have been made to explain it away. Salmasius, *in Solin.* 683 A, resolves *κολοκάσιον* into *κολὸν κάσιον* = curta lacerna, and Athene becomes 'short skirted' which she certainly was not in the Phidian tradition. Hehn has a theory scarcely less fanciful which is adopted by Murr, *op. cit.* 176. *Σικυών* derives from *σίκυος*, and was therefore the seat of a cultural industry of cucumbers and gourds, of which as 'Stadtgöttin' Athene was the tutelary 'pumpkin-goddess'; *κολοκασία* is accordingly equated to *κολοκύντη*.

Murr has shown that a large number of Greek place-names derive from plants; Hehn's theory is not therefore devoid of plausibility. But Pausanias who tells us much about Sicyon lends it no countenance. On the contrary the earliest name of Sicyon was *Αἰγιάλεια* and it received its latest from the grandson of Epopeus, *Gr. Descr.* 2. 1. 1. Sicyon had many industries, in later times that of shoes: it is scarcely probable that cucumber cultivation would be singled out for the especial protection of Athene. One may infer from the *σικυώνιον ἔλαιον*, Diosc. 1. 30. 5, that that of the olive was more important, and that Athene was its traditional protectress. Pausanias tells us that her temple at Sicyon was built by Epopeus who on its completion prayed for some sign of approval: *μετὰ δὲ τὴν εὐχὴν ἔλαιον λέγουσι ῥυῆναι πρὸ τοῦ ναοῦ*, *G. D.* 2. 6. 3. The bounty of the goddess implied the olive rather than the cucumber and was evidently the more acceptable to Epopeus: he was eventually buried in front of the altar.

Nor is it clear that Athene was preeminently the 'Stadtgöttin' of Sicyon. For Pliny tells us, *N. H.* 36. 9 and 10, the story of how its people contracted with Dipoenus and Scyllis for statues of Apollo, Diana, Heracles, and Athene; and how a dispute arose, and it required a famine and the intervention of the Pythian Apollo before the work was completed. The statue of Athene was eventually struck by lightning and never replaced. Hehn's ingenious theory lacks corroboration. We may spare ourselves the heroic necessity of having to equate *κολοκασία* with *κολοκύντη*.

Pausanias preserves a large number of local titles of Athene

and other divinities; their origin affords a fertile field for speculation. Some seem to have been merely of local association with no more than topographical meaning. The temple of *Ἀθηνᾶ Κραναία* at Elatea stood on the edge of a precipice, *ἀπότομος*, Paus. 10. 34. 7; that of *Ἀθηνᾶ Κυπαρισσία* at Asopus in Laconia, Paus. 3. 22. 9, may have taken its name from adjacent cypresses. We know that *Nelumbium* was occasionally grown in Greece; Theophrastus only mentions one locality, Torone in Macedonia, *H. P.* 4. 8. 8. Alexandrian Greeks may have brought it to Sicyon as a sacred plant, and established it near the temple of Athene. That there were such borrowings from the cult of Egypt is confirmed by Aristophanes, *Fr.* 476

Αἴγυπτον αὐτῶν τὴν πόλιν πεποίηκας ἀντ' Ἀθηνῶν.

Κολυκύντη was the Gourd, *Cucurbita maxima.* I have hitherto followed De Candolle in attributing to it an African origin: but it was unknown to the Egyptians, and better botanical evidence traces it back to north-west India. We must distinguish it from the pumpkin, *Cucurbita Pepo*, believed to be American and therefore unknown to the Greeks. Theophrastus always associates the gourd and cucumber, *τῶν λαχανωδῶν οἷον σικύου κολοκύντης*, *H. P.* 1. 12. 2. The inference is that though the gourd has developed enormously under modern cultivation, it was originally of no great size, and this throws doubt on Hehn's suggestion that *κολοκύντη* connects with *κολοσσός*.

The cucumber, *Cucumis sativus*, like the gourd, came from Northern India; *σίκυος* is apparently hellenized from Sanskrit soukasa. It is probable that more than one race reached Europe; for Theophrastus tells us, *σικύου δὲ καὶ κολυκύντης τοῦ μὲν εἶναί φασι γένη τῆς δ' οὐκ εἶναι*, *H. P.* 7. 4. 6. Our familiar Telegraph cucumber is a very specialized product of modern cultivation; some Indian races cultivated in Europe approximate in shape to elongated melons. Whether the melon as we have it was known to the Greeks is at most extremely doubtful.

23. *ὀποκάρπαθον*, Plin. *N. H.* 32. 97.

The *καρπ-* words amongst plant-names are extremely obscure and confused with one another. The information about them is scanty: but two were reputed poisonous and there seems to have been a judicious 'conspiracy of silence' amongst ancient writers on the plants used for criminal or discreditable purposes. Thus Pliny, *N. H.* 22. 78, anxious not to corrupt our morals, refuses to give us any information which would enable us to identify the plant, buprestis: 'est vero causa quare venena monstremus inter gramineas coronas'! Galen, 14. 62, goes even further: *οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ τὰς τῶν δηλητηρίων φαρμάκων γραφὰς τοὺς δημοσιεύοντας ἐπαινῶ*. Some unknown writer supplemented the reticence of Dioscorides by compiling the spurious *De venenis* attributed to him. The ninth book of Theophrastus, *H. P.*, contains some unedifying information and is no doubt equally apocryphal.

It is not surprising therefore that Pliny treats opocarpathum *N. H.* 32. 97 as something perhaps too well known. He mentions it again as opocarpatum, *N. H.* 28. 158, and as sucus carpathi, 32. 58. He always associates it with doryenium, thorn-apple, and as requiring the same antidotes. Poisoning with it must have been familiar. Pliny's sucus carpathi is reminiscent of Columella who in the choice of a site for a garden prescribes a soil unfavourable to deleterious plants: negat helleboros, et noxia carpasa succo, 10. 17; he uses the Doric form *κάρπασον* while Pliny preserves the primitive *κάρπαθον*. Here again we may assume that carpasum and its properties were within vulgar knowledge. For Columella's tenth book is thrown into the form of a poem, appealing to a popular audience, as he tells us it was written to supply the 'Georgici carminis omissas partes' and 'ex voluntate vatis maxime venerandi' with the encouragement of Virgil himself.

It is to be noticed that Columella associates *κάρπασον* with hellebores, i.e. the white and black, and implies that it was native in Italy. If it is remarkable that this is the sole reference in Latin literature which has come down to us, the reason may be that Columella has by metonymy substituted, perhaps

for metrical reasons, the name of the poison for the plant producing it, which was probably one not unknown to him.

It seems clear that the Greeks distinguished *χυλός* the raw juice of a plant from *ὀπός* the juice which had undergone some sort of preparation preserving it for use. Thus Galen, 13. 387, speaks of the admixture of *ὑοσκυάμου χυλός* with *μήκωνος ὀπός*, i.e. opium.

We look in vain in either the authentic works of Dioscorides or of Galen for any information about the poison. Galen, 12. 870, gives *ὀπὸς καρπάσου* as an ingredient in a remedy for toothache; in the *De Succedaneis*, 19. 738, he has a mere mention of it as an alternative for *σμύρνης στακτή*, something clearly different which will be considered in another note. The only account of the lethal properties of *ὀπὸς καρπάσου* which has come down to us is in the apocryphal *De venenis*, 13. I transcribe the passage: *περὶ ὀποῦ καρπάσου. καὶ ὁ τῆς καρπάσου ὀπὸς ποθεὶς κάρον ἐπιφέρει καὶ πνιγμὸν ὀξύν·— βοηθοῦνται δὲ καὶ οὗτοι, ὑφ' ὧν καὶ οἱ τὸ κώνειον πεπωκότες.* Of course *κώνειον* was too well known to the Greeks for there to be any mystery about it. The statement is repeated by Paulus Ægineta, 4. 43, who however has *καρπεσία* which is obviously a corruption. It may be noted that in the preface to the *De venenis* we have *ὀποκάρπασον*, Pliny's *ὀποκάρπαθον*.

As far as I can ascertain no attempt has been made by modern commentators to identify the poison. It was of course vegetable: and the number of plant-poisons within the knowledge of the Greeks and Romans limits the field. There is only one which fits the extreme symptoms of insensibility and constriction of the throat, and that is White Hellebore, *Veratrum album* (Taylor, *Poisons*, 575). It may be remarked incidentally that this is the 'nobis veratrum est acre venenum' of Lucretius, 4. 642.

Helleborus albus had an immense vogue in medicine; the dried rootlets were used, ground to powder, farina, and administered in porridge. Pliny, *N. H.* 25. 56, describes the effects as alarming, strangulatus, intempestivas somni vires, precisely those of *ὀπὸς καρπάσου*. Dioscorides himself, 4. 148, is silent as to its poisonous properties except *μύας κτείνει*

σὺν μέλιτι, but mentions *ὁ Γαλατικὸς καὶ Καππαδοκικός* as *πυγωδέστερος*. Galen 11. 874 says nothing of its internal administration: it had probably fallen out of use except for external application.

Except the single instance in Galen there is no evidence that *ὀπὸς καρπάσου* was used in medicine. It may be conjectured that it was a concentrated extract, probably at first fluid but reduced to a solid by evaporation: a poison is likely to be compendious. It is not improbable that primarily it was an arrow-poison, for Pliny, *N. H.* 25. 61, says Galli sagittas in venatu helleboro tingunt. It may not be without significance that Pliny associates *ὀποκάρπαθον* with *δορύκνιον* which he says was so called quod cuspides in proeliis tinguerentur illo, *N. H.* 21. 179.

The poison like *μήκωνος ὀπός* was probably of local manufacture: its source may not have been generally known though Columella must have had some shrewd suspicion about it.

There is only one mention of *κάρπαθον* in Dioscorides, a synonym for *περικλύμενον*, Ps. Dsc. 4. 14; but this was a honeysuckle, *Lonicera etrusca*, apparently a mild tonic and in no sense poisonous. I can only conjecture that the name in this case meant a plant of *Κάρπαθος*. In *A Companion to Latin Studies*, 84, I have hazarded the suggestion that *κάρπασον*, sucus carpathi, derived its name from the same island.

There is some evidence that the identity of *κάρπαθον* with white hellebore was recognized in later times: for L. and S. quote *καρπίον* from the Hippiatr. as a 'vulgar name for *ἑλλέβορος*' and this is represented in Modern Greek by *σκάρφη* in the same way as *Κάρπαθος* has become Scarpanto.

24. *ὀποκάλπασον*, Gal. 14. 56.

This is a perplexing problem. It is clear that it is the *ὀπὸς καρπάσου* which Galen, *De Succedaneis*, 19. 738, enumerates amongst alternatives for *σμύρνης στακτή* the oil from crushed myrrh. Stephanus followed by the lexicons cuts the knot by identifying it with *ὀποκάρπαθον*. But this is not sustainable other than etymologically. When Columella, 10. 17, wrote of

plants undesirable on the site of a Roman garden, negat helleboros et noxia carpasa succo, he clearly had in mind something that would grow in a Mediterranean country and not an exotic from the shores of the Red Sea.

Galen gives us some very definite information: *κατὰ τὴν ἀρίστην σμύρναν ὀποκάλπασον εὑρίσκεται, διαφέρον σμύρνης*, 14. 56. But, as in other similar cases, it was difficult to discriminate; *οἱ μὲν ἀήθεις ὄντες οὐ δύνανται διακρίνειν τὸ ἕτερον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑτέρου*. Disastrous consequences followed; *τὸ δὲ ὀποκάλπασον ἀναιρετικόν ἐστι καὶ πολλοὺς κατά τινα τύχην ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἡμετέρας ζωῆς χρόνοις ἀποθανόντας οἶδα διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν τῆς ὀποκάλπασον ἐχούσης σμύρνης*, 14. 57.

Now *σμύρνη* or myrrha, myrrh, was a resinous exudation from the stem of *Balsamodendron Myrrha*: it hardened into a tear, and hence Dioscorides 1. 64 states, *σμύρνα δάκρυόν ἐστι δένδρου γεννωμένου ἐν Ἀραβίᾳ*. It is clear that *ὀποκάλπασον* was an inferior sort of myrrh, *τοιαύτη σμύρνη*, Gal. 14. 58, apt to be intermixed with the true product. Such are still to be found in commerce; they are derived from other species of *Balsamodendron* and I have investigated them in the *Kew Bulletin*, 1896, pp. 86–95. Here the enquiry would have to stop but for another piece of information which Galen gives us incidentally. He often writes with a delightful simplicity, and he tells us, 12. 443, that though it is no part of a physician's business to advise ladies about dyeing or bleaching their hair, it has to be faced when *ἐνίοτε βασιλικαὶ γυναῖκες, αἷς οὐκ ἔστιν ἀρνήσασθαι, μελανθῆναι βούλονται τὰς τρίχας ἢ ξανθισθῆναι*. It may be suspected that the practice was not confined in earlier times to princesses; for the *κόμας ὑακινθίνῳ ἄνθει ὁμοίας*, *Od.* 6. 231 of Ulysses, become *ξανθὰς τρίχας* in *Od.* 13. 399; it is common enough amongst savage races. Galen preserves for us the methods prescribed by Archigenes: these are followed by those for *οὐλοποίησις, οὐλὰς δὲ ποιήσεις τρίχας, ἐὰν ἀφρῷ ἁλὸς μετὰ σμύρνης σμήχῃς*, 12. 445, where *ἀφρὸς ἁλός* is obviously reminiscent of *Od.* 6. 226–231, *ἐκ κεφαλῆς δ' ἔσμηχεν ἁλὸς χνόον... | ...κὰδ δὲ κάρητος | οὔλας ἦκε κόμας*. I suspect, for a reason to be explained presently, that the *σμύρνη* was either *ὀπὸς καρπάσου* or mixed with it: for Archigenes pro-

ceeds, *ἢ ὀπῷ καρπάσου χρῖε καὶ μένουσιν οὖλαι καὶ μέλαιναι*. it cleaned the hair without taking out its curl or changing its colour.

This solves the problem: there can be no doubt that this *ὀπὸς καρπάσου* was identical with hotai, a spurious Myrrh produced by a spiny shrub, *Balsamodendron Playfairii*, growing in great abundance all along the Somali coast. In the *Kew Bulletin*, 1896, 94, 95, I have collected all the available information about it. The gum occurs in large tears: with water it readily forms a frothy emulsion: it is collected by the Somalis, who use it as soap and especially for cleansing the hair. It may be objected that myrrh was Arabian and hotai is African: but the former is not collected by the Arabs but by Somalis who cross the sea for the purpose and pay a tribute for the privilege: it may be conjectured that the collection of myrrh by the Somalis goes back to antiquity. That they should have mixed the genuine and spurious kinds is not surprising: nor was it necessarily dishonest, for Prof. Engler of Berlin, the most recent writer on myrrh-producing plants, has fallen into the error of identifying the plants producing myrrh and hotai and therefore inferentially the products themselves.

The poisonous properties of *ὀποκάλπασον* now require elucidation. Myrrh is certainly innocuous, it was little used in medicine and merely survives on its reputation. I have verified the interesting fact that an offering of it is made annually by the Sovereign at the Feast of Epiphany at the Chapel Royal, St James. Hotai is in a different position. I am not aware that it has ever been subjected to chemical analysis: but the fact that it forms a frothy emulsion with water and is used as soap points to its containing saponin, a principle widely diffused in the vegetable kingdom, but quite haphazard. Plants containing it are known as Soapworts: they have the property of cleansing woollen textiles especially without as Archigenes says affecting either the texture or the colour; and this is more than can be said of soaps of chemical origin. The soapwort most in use in modern times is Quillaia bark, the *Bois de Panama*, to be found in every French town: it is the product of a Chilian tree, *Quillaja saponaria*. Its commercial import-

ance may be inferred from the fact that on November 23, 1916, it was declared absolute contraband by an order in Council.

Now saponin is a poison though not a very virulent one. Hotai is described as 'acrid to the throat.' This agrees with saponin which acts as 'a local irritant in the alimentary canal, and after absorption is more or less depressing to the muscular and nervous systems.' It is quite conceivable that in considerable amount the result might be fatal. Galen at any rate forbids the administration of *ὀποκάλπασον* internally: but if used *εἰς ἔμπλαστρον, αὐξήσεις αὐτοῦ τὴν δύναμιν*, 14. 58, the acridity of hotai would add to its stimulating effect.

The problem still remains of the confusion of two different things as *ὀπὸς καρπάσου*. Apparently Galen followed Archigenes. But such transfers of names are not uncommon: *κολοκασία* is an example. We ourselves have identified *κέδρος*, a juniper, with a *Pinus* and used it as well for scores of other trees.

25. *καρπήσιον*, Gal. 12. 15.

Liddell and Scott define this as 'an aromatic wood chiefly brought from Asia, Galen.' What he actually says is, however *ὅμοιον μὲν ὑπάρχει τῷ καλουμένῳ φοῦ κατά τε τὴν γεῦσιν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν*, 12. 15. Dioscorides says of *φοῦ*, 1. 11, *οἱ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἀγρίαν νάρδον καλοῦσι· γεννᾶται μὲν ἐν Πόντῳ*. It may be inferred that it was a substitute for the costly aromatic nard which was an Indian Valerianaceous plant. *φοῦ* was a Valerian and the description given by Dioscorides fits *Valeriana Phu*. The Greeks and Romans appreciated the Valerian odour and flavour: it was an Indian taste which does not commend itself to modern Western peoples. *καρπήσιον* must also have been a Valerian and therefore could not be a 'wood,' though it was aromatic: *ἔστι γὰρ αὐτὸ παραπλήσιον μὲν [τῷ φοῦ], ἰσχυρότερον δέ, καὶ...ἔχον τι ποιότητος ἀρωματιζούσης ἐν ὀσμῇ τε καὶ γεύσει*, Gal. 14. 72. According to Galen 12. 15 and 16, it was found in Pontus, Pamphylia, and Syria: this fits in with *Valeriana Dioscoridis* which according to Boissier occurs in all three localities. From a therapeutic point of view he adds of the Pontic sort, *οὐ μὴν οὐδ' αὐτὸ πλησίον κινναμώμου τὴν*

δύναμιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῆς ἀρίστης κασίας οὐκ ὀλίγῳ λειπόμενον, 12. 15. But he goes farther and makes the perplexing statement as regards the Pamphylian, *λεπτὰ δέ ἐστι τὰ κάρφη, παραπλήσια τοῖς ἀκρέμοσι τοῦ κινναμώμου*, 14. 72. How could any part of a herb resemble the twigs of a woody plant? It must be premised that Galen was only a physician and not a botanist as well, like Dioscorides. He deals with drugs as he accepted them from the pharmacist, mere dried fragmentary parts, often necessarily ambiguous in their nature. He seems to have satisfied himself from their examination that *κασσία* and *κιννάμωμον* as he met with them were derived from the same tree, and this is probable enough: it was *Cinnamomum iners* from Southern India. He says, 14. 70, *καὶ γὰρ καὶ γίνεταί ποτε κιννάμωμον ἐκ μεταβολῆς αὐτῆς* [sc. *κασσίας*], *ὥστε ὅλον μὲν ὁρᾶσθαι τὸ οἷον δένδρον ἀκριβῶς κασσίαν, ἀκρέμονας δέ τινας ἐν αὐτῷ κιννάμωμον*. But, as Dioscorides, 1. 14, reminds us, *κινναμώμου ἐστὶ πλείονα εἴδη ὀνομαζόμενα*. The only possible explanation of *λεπτὰ κάρφη* seems to me that given by Matthioli as long ago as 1564, *Comm. Diosc.* 42, that they were the dried slender fleshy roots which we know the Valerian to possess, and he points out that Galen, 14. 66, had already compared *κιννάμωμον* to the rootlets of hellebores, *οἷα περὶ τῶν ἑλλεβόρων ἀμφοτέρων ἰδέα ἐστί*. This disposes of the only piece of evidence to support the theory that *καρπήσιον* was an aromatic wood of Indian origin.

26. *ξυλοκάρπασον*, Galen, 19. 731 and 738.

The word does not appear to occur elsewhere. Liddell and Scott give it with the explanation 'the wood of flax.' But the flax-plant is herbaceous and not woody. It is true that the flax-fibres in the slender stems surround a woody core: but this is broken up and combed out in preparing flax for spinning. In the ordinary sense of the word 'wood of flax' does not exist.

Galen gives the word in the *De Succedaneis* first as a substitute for *καρδάμωμον*, secondly as itself replaceable by *κιννάμωμον*. The obvious inference is that it was aromatic. We may conclude then pretty safely that *ξυλοκαρπασον* stood in

the same relation to *ὀπὸς καρπάσου* that *ξυλοβάλσαμον* does to *ὀπὸς βαλσάμου*, and that it consisted of the twigs of the myrrh-producing plant *Balsamodendron Playfairii* discussed in a previous note.

The error into which Liddell and Scott have fallen is based on one which lurks in the lexicons. Thus Andrews quotes 'carbasa' [for carpasa], Col. 10. 17, as an irregular plural of carbasus. This we know from Pliny, *N. H.* 19. 10, was a fine linen produced in Spain, 'tenuitas mira ibi primum carbasis repertis.' It is generally admitted that carbasus is latinized from *κάρπασος* which occurs in the *Periplus M. R.* 41 and means cotton: it in turn represents the Sanskrit karpāsa. Lucan, *Phars.* 3. 239, describing India, can only have had cotton-muslin in mind, fluxa coloratis adstringunt carbasa gemmis. The noxia carpasa succo of Columella was as pointed out in a previous note a poison and not a textile.

It is reasonable to suppose that the cotton-fabrics which reached Europe from India would be muslins and fine in texture; little would be known of their material, and their name would come to denote only textile quality and so be used to include the fine linens of Tarragona which resembled them in fineness.

In a previous note on *βύσσος* I have pointed out that the Mediterranean region had its own indigenous flax, a perennial species, *Linum angustifolium*, which supplied a textile material in the prehistoric age, but was displaced by the Asiatic cultivated plant. I learn from Mr W. F. Smith that Sir James Frazer, whose Commentary on Pausanias I had not been able to consult, is in agreement in it 'on the subject of *βύσσος*' as a survival of the prehistoric textile.

I must correct an error into which I had fallen in overlooking the fact that the Russian *Linum perenne*, no doubt also a prehistoric textile plant, is distinct from the Mediterranean *Linum angustifolium* which at one time had been identified with it.

W. T. THISELTON-DYER.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY J. B. PEACE, M.A., AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

BIBL. LONDIN. UNIV.

Vol. XXXIII. No. 65.

The Journal

OF

PHILOLOGY.

EDITED BY

W. ALDIS WRIGHT, M.A.

INGRAM BYWATER, M.A.

HENRY JACKSON, Litt.D.

H. W. GARROD, M.A.

London:

MACMILLAN AND CO., Ltd.

Cambridge: BOWES AND BOWES,
DEIGHTON, BELL AND CO.

1913

Price 4s. 6d.

CONTENTS. No. LXV.

	PAGE
On Apollonius Rhodius. Arthur Platt	1
AIOΣ and EIOΣ in Latin Poetry. A. E. Housman	54
The Latinizations of the Modern Surname. I. Bywater	76
The Doom of the Argonauts. W. R. Hardie	95
Notes on Manil. iv, 590 and Lucr. v, 1009—1010. W. R. Hardie	102
The Transpadani and the Colony of Novum Comum. E. G. Hardy	103
The ΣΥΡΙΓΞ Technopaegnium. A. S. F. Gow	128
Three Passages of Cicero's Letters. J. D. Duff	139
An Oracle in Procopius. Henry Jackson	142

Macmillan's New and Recent Works for Classical Students

The Annual of the British School at Athens.

No. XVIII. Session 1911—1912. With 16 Plates. Crown 4to. 25*s.* net.

CONTENTS.—Excavations at Halos. By A. J. B. Wace and M. S. Thompson.—The Apollo Temple on Sikinos. By R. M. Dawkins.—Sketches in the Religious Antiquities of Asia Minor. By W. M. Ramsay.—Prehistoric Remains in S.W. Asia Minor. By H. A. Ormerod.—A Mycenæan Bronze in the Cyprus Museum. By M. Markides.—The Greek Numeral Notation. By M. N. Tod.—Inscriptions from Berœa in Macedonia. By A. M. Woodward.—Inscriptions from Upper Macedonia. By A. J. B. Wace and A. M. Woodward.—The Topography of Bœotia and the Theories of M. Bérard. By A. W. Gomme.—Datcha—Stadia—Halikarnossos, Note on a Greek Inscription of the Knights at Budrum. Note on the Tholos Tomb at Kirk Kilisse. By F. W. Hasluck.—The Master of the Eucharides-Stamnos in Copenhagen. By J. D. Beazley.—Damis of Nineveh and Walter of Oxford: a Literary Parallel. By W. R. Halliday.—The Acclamation of Emperors in Byzantine Ritual. By H. J. W. Tillyard.—On Imitations of the Venetian Sequin struck for the Levant. By F. W. Hasluck.—Plato in the Folklore of the Konia Plain: Topographical Drawings in the British Museum illustrating Classical Sites and Remains in Greece and Turkey. By F. W. Hasluck.—A Possible Egyptian Dating for the End of the Third Late Minoan Period. By T. E. Peet.—The Topography of the Scamander Valley—II.: Trade Routes and Constantinople. By W. Leaf.

Greek Divination: A Study of its Methods and Principles.

By W. R. Halliday, B.A., B.Litt., Lecturer on Greek History and Archæology in the University of Glasgow, Sometime Scholar of New College, Craven Fellow in the University of Oxford, and Student of the British School at Athens. Crown 8vo. 5*s.* net.

Troy: A Study in Homeric Geography.

By Walter Leaf, Litt.D., sometime Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. With Maps, Plans and Illustrations. 8vo. 12*s.* net.

A History of the Eastern Roman Empire

from the Fall of Irene to the Accession of Basil I. (A.D. 802—867). By J. B. Bury, Litt.D., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Cambridge. 8vo. 12*s.* net.

MACMILLAN & CO., LTD., LONDON

Papers of the British School at Rome

Vol. II. **SIXTEENTH-CENTURY DRAWINGS OF ROMAN BUILDINGS.** Attributed to ANDREAS CONER.

By T. ASHBY, Jun., M.A., F.S.A., Assistant Director of the School.

Super royal 8vo, 30*s.* net; or with a Special Title-Page, bound in half-roan gilt, 35*s.* net.

Vol. III. With Illustrations and Maps. Super royal 8vo. 30*s.* net.

CONTENTS.—The Classical Topography of the Roman Campagna. II. By Dr T. ASHBY, Jun., Assistant Director of the School.—Notes on Roman Historical Sculptures. By H. STUART JONES, lately Director of the British School at Rome.—Fragments of Roman Historical Reliefs in the Lateran and Vatican Museums. By A. J. B. WACE.—Some Drawings from the Antique, attributed to Pisanello. By G. F. HILL (with two collotype plates).—A Portrait of Pythagoras. By Miss K. A. McDOWELL.

Vol. IV. With Illustrations and Maps. 31*s.* 6*d.* net.

CONTENTS.—The Classical Topography of the Roman Campagna. III. I., by Dr T. ASHBY, Director of the School.—The Goldsmiths of Rome under the Papal Authority. By S. J. A. CHURCHILL, M.V.O.—Studies in Roman Historical Reliefs. By A. J. B. WACE, M.A.—An Ivory Statuette. By A. H. S. YEAMES, M.A.—The Early Iron Age in South Italy. By T. E. PEET, B.A.

Vol. V. With 47 Plates and numerous other Illustrations in Text. 42*s.* net.

CONTENTS.—The Text of the Odyssey. By T. W. ALLEN.—The Dolmens, Tombs of the Giants, and Nuraghi of Sardinia. By D. MACKENZIE.—Contributions to the Study of the Prehistoric Period in Malta. By T. E. PEET.—The Reliefs in the Palazzo Spada. By A. J. B. WACE.—La Civita in the Valley of the Sabato. By C. L. WOOLLEY.—The Classical Topography of the Roman Campagna. III. (The Via Latina.) Section II. By T. ASHBY.—The Historical Interpretation of the Reliefs of Trajan's Column. By H. STUART JONES.—The Columbarium of Pomponius Hylas on the Via Latina. By F. G. NEWTON.

Vol. VI. With Plates and Maps. Super royal 8vo. 42*s.* net.

[*Just Published.*

CONTENTS: Excavations in 1908–11 in the various Megalithic Buildings in Malta and Gozo. By T. ASHBY, R. N. BRADLEY, T. E. PEET and N. TAGLIAFERRO.—Dolmens and Nuraghi of Sardinia. By D. MACKENZIE.—Adventus Augusti: a Drawing attributed to Giovanni Antonio da Brescia. By S. COLVIN.—Six Drawings from the Column of Trajan, with the date 1467; and a Note on the Date of Giacomo Ripanda. By E. STRONG.—Addenda and Corrigenda to XVIth Century Drawings of Roman Buildings attributed to Andreas Coner. By T. ASHBY.—The Norman Administration of Apulia and Capua, more especially under Roger II. and William I. By E. JAMISON.—Rome in 1622. By A. H. S. YEAMES.—Thomas Jenkins in Rome. By T. ASHBY.

MACMILLAN AND CO., Ltd., LONDON.

Macmillan's Forthcoming Works for Classical Students

SIR ARTHUR EVANS, F.R.S.

The Nine Minoan Periods. A Summary Sketch of the Characteristic Stages of Cretan Civilisation, from the Close of the Neolithic to the Beginning of the Iron Age, with special reference to the Antiquities of Knossos. By Sir ARTHUR EVANS, F.R.S. With numerous Illustrations. 4to.

An Atlas of Knossian Antiquities. Edited, with Explanatory Text, by Sir ARTHUR EVANS, F.R.S. In a box. 4to.

ORIC BATES

The Eastern Libyans. An Essay. By ORIC BATES, B.A., F.R.G.S., late Inspector Nubian Archaeological Survey. With numerous Illustrations. 4to.

PROF. PERCY GARDNER

The Principles of Greek Art. By PERCY GARDNER, Litt.D., Professor of Classical Archaeology in the University of Oxford. Crown 8vo.

This is a revised and largely re-written edition of Professor Gardner's *Grammar of Greek Art.* The changes and additions are so considerable that it is, in effect, a new book.

MACMILLAN & CO., LTD., LONDON